FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report
Supplement

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-128S
Tuesday
5 July 1988

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT

FBIS-SOV-88-128 *5 July 1988*

CONTENTS

19th CPSU CONFERENCE

Yakovlev Cited on Legal State, One-Party System *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 27]* 1
Further Reportage on Second Day Proceedings 1
- Ukraine's Kachura Speech *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 1
- Fedotova on Education *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 4
- Bondarev Criticizes Press *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 6
- Krasnodar Chief Polozkov *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 9
- Mironenko on Youth Problems *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 12
- Kabaidze's Address *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 15
- Latvia's Pugo on National Issues *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 16

Uzbekistan's Nishanov Holds News Conference *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 19
Further on Third Day Speeches, Activities 20
- Speeches Summarized 20
- Ryzhkov Opens Morning Session 23
- Postnikov Decries 'Mafia' 23
- Metalworker Yarin Address 24
- Yarin on Pollution Problems *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 24
- Academician Logunov's Speech 27
- Logunov Speech Published *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 27
- Melnikov Urges Gromyko Ouster 30
- PRAVDA Account Published *[1 Jul]* 31
- Patiashvili on Leadership *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 33
- Starodubtsev Chides Ministries *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 36
- Razumovskiy on Bribe-Taking Issue 37
- Statement Stirs Audience Reaction 38
- OGONEK's Korotich Responds 38
- Romazanov's Conference Speech *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 39
- Saranskikh Address *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 41
- Zhivetyeva Address *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 43
- Uzbek Chief Nishanov Speech 44
- Nishanov Speech Published *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 45
- IZVESTIYA's Laptev Speaks *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 47
- Gorbachev on Procedural Issues 50
- Fedorov Urges Emphasis on Individual 51
- Fedorov on 'Accountability' *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 52
- TV Camera Complaint Cited 54
- Delegate Defends Gromyko 54
- Peace Committee Chairman Borovik 55
- Discusses Khrushchev, Brezhnev 56
- Attacks Nationalism *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 56
- Platonov's Address *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 58
- Zakharova Notes Local Problems *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 60
- Fateyev Addresses Conference *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 62
- Zagaynov Remarks 64
- Urges Yeltsin Explanation *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 65
- Nizhelskiy, Gorbachev Exchange 68
- Nizhelskiy Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 69
- Lithuanian Chief Songayla *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 70
- Aydak Condemns Official Privelege 72

Belorussians Note 'Favorable Conditions' 72
Delegates Comment on Speeches, Debates *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]* 73
Kryuchkov Comments on Melnikov Speech 74
More on Armenian Leaders' News Conference *[TRUD 1 Jul]* 74

Fourth Day Proceedings, Speeches Reported 74
Conference Session Round-Up 74
Better Lot for Women Urged *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 76
Gorbachev Opens Afternoon Session 76
Gives Report on Procedure 77
Moldavia's Grossu Address 77
Grossu Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 78
Brevity in Speeches Urged *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 80
Makhkamov Addresses Conference 81
Falling Education Standards Seen 81
Yagodin Discusses Education Tasks *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 82
Rostov Chief Volodin's Speech 84
Volodin Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 85
Yeltsin Asks for Rehabilitation 86
Yeltsin Addresses Conference 87
Yeltsin Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 88
Gorbachev Chairs Session 92
Usmanov on Yeltsin Rehabilitation 92
Usmanov Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 93
AUCCTU's Shalayev Speaks *[PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 94
Estonia's Vyalyas Delivers Speech 96
Assails Yeltsin Tactlessness *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 97
Pukhova on Women's Status *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 99
Ligachev on Yeltsin Address 101
Ligachev Address Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 104
Kvitsinskiy Address 107
Comments on Bloc Parliament *[PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 108
Turkmen Chief Niyazov's Speech *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 111
PRAVDA's Afanasyev Address 113
Afanasyev Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 114
Volkov Defends Yeltsin *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 115
Chikirev Attacks Yeltsin's Record *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 116
Lukin Attacks Yeltsin *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 116
Gorbachev Concluding Speech 117
PRAVDA Publishes Speech *[2 Jul]* 124
Party Conference Resolutions Adopted 128
Delegates Vote; Proceedings Close *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 129
Political Reform Resolution *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 130
Anti-Bureaucracy Resolution *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 134
Interethnic Relations Resolution *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 137
Resolution on Legal Reform *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 139
Resolution on Glasnost *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 141
Resolution on Restructuring *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 143
PRAVDA Editorial on Conference, Future *[4 Jul]* 148

Yakovlev Cited on Legal State, One-Party System

PM0107155288 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 27, 2-8 Jul 88 (Signed to Press 30 Jun) p 2

[Unattributed report on CPSU Central Committee Politburo member A.N. Yakovlev meeting with Soviet and foreign journalists at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference press center on 28 June: "Creating a State Ruled by Law"]

[Excerpts] A meeting between A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and Soviet and foreign journalists took place at the press center on 28 June, in the course of which he answered a number of questions. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] What, in your view, will be the main result of the conference?

Yakovlev: I think that the main result will be, first and foremost, the transformation of society on democratic principles, and the associated formation of a state ruled by law, in which the law will be placed in such a position that it will have power over everyone. If you ask whether the measures now being proposed for the democratization of society are sufficient, the answer is: Under the given concrete conditions, under the given circumstances, at the present stage of our development—this is the optimum option. In the future, we will see and we will develop.

[Unidentified correspondent] In his report M.S. Gorbachev said that it is necessary to establish a state mechanism that accords with the interests of all population groups. How will this mechanism work within the framework of a one-party system?

Yakovlev: In my view that is a very old, ancient question. There are plenty of options here, the question is resolved by each country in its own way. And if, in accordance with your logic, we are to talk about how the interests of all social groups can be expressed under a one-party system, I would ask you a question in return: How many parties do you need, then, if the number of social interests in the country is 1,000, 3,000, a million? Does that mean you need a million parties? A party, if it is a serious political force with concrete program objectives, can unite a large proportion of the country's population and lead them to the implementation of objectives. Our one-party system and our state cannot be compared with states where private ownership predominates. In our country both party and state are engaged in economic, social, and management affairs, and so forth. Therefore, if we were to launch a multiparty system now, under conditions where socialist ownership predominates, then there would be nothing but anarchy.

[Unidentified correspondent] Please comment on the fact that M.S. Gorbachev has recommended that the first secretaries of local party organizations be elected chairmen of the soviets. Would that not mean the complete subordination of local soviets to the party?

Yakovlev: First, I would not want to separate the party from the soviets. Second, at present, as the report says, party organs, raykoms, and gorkoms concentrate within themselves not only political power, but also economic and executive power. The delimitation of functions is an important task. Everyone should do his job. The party should do its job, the government its job, and the soviets theirs. All the legislative, executive, and controlling power should rest with the soviets. But in order to unite everyone on the basis of this idea and ensure that the party and the soviets reach a consensus, we consider it necessary for the party organization first secretary to be the soviet chairman too, so that he can lead the soviet as the representative organ of the people. Thus, he must receive two mandates: First, the party organization of the region in question must authorize him to do this, and, second, he will be elected by secret ballot in the soviet. As was noted in the report, if he is not elected in the soviet, then the party organization should reexamine his status as leader. This system has been tried and tested in many countries.

[Unidentified correspondent] We journalists were rather concerned that when M.S. Gorbachev spoke of journalists' great responsibility and the importance of careful consideration of what they do, tumultuous applause broke out in the auditorium, yet when he then drew attention to the impermissibility of the suppression of criticism and reprisals for it, the auditorium was silent.

Yakovlev: That, too, is a reality that must be reckoned with. I think the success of the policy of glasnost depends on the quality of glasnost, on truthfulness. In recent years the press has done tremendous cleaning-up work. Indeed, without glasnost we could not have achieved the high level of social development we have today. But this is what people write about, and we receive tens of thousands of letters. They support glasnost and the freedom to express different opinions. They note that the press has become open, bold, aggressive. But they do not support untruths and the distortion of facts. The journalist can do anything—criticize the authorities and bureaucracy, but let him criticize specific individuals, and, most importantly, any criticism, even if it is sharp, must be just. The protection of human dignity—that is the meaning of restructuring. [passage omitted]

Further Reportage on Second Day Proceedings

Ukraine's Kachura Speech

PM0107154588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by B.V. Kachura, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, at the 29 June afternoon session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! The decisions that Communists have entrusted us with making will clearly be of major importance for the fate of restructuring. As such,

they will also determine the country's future to a great extent. Having drawn conclusions from a profound analysis of the historical past and present, since the April Central Committee Plenum and the 27th congress, the party has firmly and consistently pursued a line of restructuring and acceleration. This is confirmed by the atmosphere of the conference and by the course of the discussion of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report.

We must be blunt in saying that never since Lenin's time have changes in both domestic and foreign policy gathered such scope and depth. In terms of the scale of the transformations in our society, the 3 years of restructuring are equivalent to other decades. To me it is important that the complex of problems which have come to a head in every sector of society is examined in the report from the angle of the ultimate aim—improving the people's material and spiritual standards of living and ensuring their vital needs.

On the threshold of the conference, an open, direct discussion going far beyond the bounds of labor collectives' interests took place in the republic's enterprises and organizations. The discussion of the Central Committee Theses showed yet again that the political atmosphere in our society has changed radically and people have, as it were, shaken off the fetters of indifference and fear. Lively interest in the country's political life and a desire to take an active part in restructuring and in implementing the party's plans are reviving among Communists and nonparty people. It is in this, more than anything else, that the people's unequivocal support for the party's line of restructuring is displayed. Today everyone is perturbed by the key problem—the reconstruction of the political system and broad democratization of the life of the party and society. From this perspective, the report takes a major new step in the theory and practice of restructuring and formulates a comprehensively substantiated concept of a political mechanism, including a transformation of the potential energy of the broadest people's masses. This is the guarantee of the success of restructuring, the guarantee of its irreversibility.

The proposals for cadre rotation, for restructuring the work of the soviets, for instituting the post of chairman of the country's Supreme Soviet, and for forming a state based on law also accord with the demands of the time.

In addition, it is obvious that in conditions of deepening democratization, questions of glasnost, personal rights and duties, and freedom of conscience must be bolstered by legislation. The need for legislative protection against any speculation on democratization that runs counter to the people's interests is equally overdue. The CPSU Central Committee line on these questions must certainly be reflected in the draft conference resolutions and will be supported by the delegates.

Life cogently confirms that in the new conditions, the enhancement of the party's vanguard role is an inalienable task in democratization. The same is true of the assertion of its leading role, not by issuing commands but by persuading the masses.

To take the practical aspect, the whole problem, its entire crux, so to speak, lies primarily in the clear demarcation of the functions of party, soviet, and economic organs and public organizations. No matter how much we talk, no matter how many decisions we make on the theme of not supplanting soviet and economic organizations, their supplanting continues. It is particularly difficult to overcome it on the local level. In our view, this may be largely explained by the very structure of party committees, which should certainly be brought into line with the new tasks.

It must be said that, despite the creation of new, plenipotentiary state organs, the CPSU Central Committee still holds numerous conferences and adopts decisions on economic questions that are fully within the competence of the government.

We should make separate mention of the importance of the proposals intended to restructure the party's ideological activity. Of course, in Vladimir Ilich Lenin's words, the first task that will face any future party will be to convince the majority of the people of the correctness of its program and tactics. At the present stage, we can say that this task has been accomplished.

However, it would be an unforgivable error to portray public opinion as free of contradictions and of differing, and sometimes diametrically opposed, views, which is something that has emerged both in the discussion of the Central Committee Theses and at our conference. In particular, while supporting the tenet regarding socialist pluralism of opinions, many speakers have resolutely opposed the intention to involve people in a debate on the need for a multiparty system and have come out against attempts to foster the opinion that restructuring is not working and that it has no prospects. In other words, speculating about existing difficulties, the proponents of a conservative consciousness and dogmatic notions of socialism are refusing to see the profound positive shifts that are taking place. They have refused to come to terms with reality and have been slow to surrender their positions, although it is clear to any sober-minded person that the majority of existing problems do not stem from, but were revealed by, restructuring. Comrades, it is very difficult to get away from established habits, stereotypes, and views, to learn to take a fresh look at style and methods of work that seemed immutable, and to learn not to impede but to promote the development of people's initiative and independence.

We are still not always able to take fullest advantage of such powerful media as the press, television, and radio. They could be used to study public opinion and to unite

and mobilize society on the basis of the ideas of restructuring. The media must always propagandize, and uphold from a party standpoint the working people's genuine interests and the interests of socialism.

Comrades, questions of nationalities policy have always been topical, and now they require particularly close attention. Even the episode at the conference regarding the membership of the commission to prepare the resolution on this question shows the importance and acuteness of the problem.

The report reveals pressing problems in interethnic relations in a well thought-out way. New approaches have been put forward in view of the peculiar nature of the present situation. The need for an uncompromising struggle against any manifestations of national egoism and parochialism is correctly emphasized.

I believe that the considered, fully democratic approach toward implementing the tasks of developing our united union state and national cultures and more fully satisfying the requirements of national groups will meet with the support of conference delegates from all republics.

The republican party organization, which is currently celebrating its 70th anniversary, has always attached paramount importance to the implementation of a Leninist nationalities policy and to its protection from various nationalist onslaughts. As far as the Ukrainian people are concerned, the fundamental basis of the international fraternity of the country's peoples is sacred and immutable. Only a sincerely convinced internationalist can be a genuine patriot.

In preparing for the upcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum, which will be devoted to questions of nationalities policy, we are rethinking from the standpoint of the present day and practically restructuring work on people's patriotic and international education. We are also trying to resolve them thoughtfully, as an integral part of socioeconomic and political tasks.

It is very important that the report raises the correlation between centralism and democratism in a new way, from the point of view of restructuring. In doing so, it emphasizes the expansion of the rights of local organs on the basis of the principles of self-management, self-financing, and self-sufficiency. If this task is to be resolved successfully while observing in an unquestioning way the priority of the country's unified national economic complex, we will, in drafting long-term plans, have to take fuller account of the economic structure prevailing in individual regions, demographic trends, and the ecological situation. We will have to pay special attention to the more profound study of the siting of major power industry and industrial facilities. Clearly, the time has come to adopt an appropriate law defining as a package the rights and duties of union and autonomous republics.

As for economic reform, the results of the first half of the 5-year plan in the republic show that we are gradually beginning to emerge from the grave situation in which we found ourselves. The growth rates for industrial output and labor productivity have increased markedly. Positive shifts have occurred in the social sphere as well. For instance, over the 5-year plan period we will have fulfilled six annual plans for the commissioning of housing. This will have expedited the rehousing of over 4 million people.

Nevertheless, economic reform is still not proceeding as fruitfully as we would like. Naturally, there are various reasons for this. There are many shortcomings in the organization of production and material and technical supply. Economic methods of management and labor incentives are being introduced extremely slowly. We have yet to substantially reduce the difficulties in supplying the population with certain foodstuffs and consumer goods. Under no circumstances can one say that all leaders, including those at the republican level, have shown sufficient enterprise or have renounced the old methods of leadership. Unsatisfactory use is still being made of the rights granted by the laws on the cooperative system, the state enterprise, and individual labor activity and the various forms of contract. In general, comrades, we are not satisfied with the course of restructuring in the republic. More could certainly have been done.

At the same time, though, we must accelerate the restructuring of the style and methods of work of central ministries and departments. Essentially, what we have seen there recently has been a fight for survival and the apparatus is "sitting on its suitcases," so to speak. Clearly, this is one reason why the elaboration of many normative documents has been unduly delayed, while many of those that are adopted are insufficiently thought out and require clarification or replacement almost immediately. The initiative of many collectives has yet to be truly unleashed. They do not have the necessary independence, and instructions, which often run counter to the principles of the reform, are a dead weight on them. State orders, normatives, and certain other innovations are actually transformed into the same old bureaucratic willfulness. This year, for instance, in order to meet the state order and direct delivery contracts, the republic's metallurgists must produce over 1 million tonnes of finished rolled metal above and beyond the plan. The USSR Gosplan and the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy are well aware that this is simply unrealistic, given the current production base. However, any failure to fulfill the orders will naturally place many labor collectives in the sector in a grave financial and economic position. We are not dealing with isolated examples.

Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute, spoke yesterday. I can scarcely agree with all the propositions he voiced. I would merely like to stress that economists too must full bear responsibility and, I would say, equal measure for

the credit of trust that the working people have extended to the party with regard to restructuring. (Applause) We must fight for the success of the economic reform, we must all fight together, and that goes primarily for the economists.

There is something else that I would like to emphasize, comrades. Taking the lessons of the first years of restructuring into account, it is extremely important when shaping structural investment policy for the 13th 5-Year Plan to ensure, above all else, an improvement in capital construction. In addition, we must pay special attention and guarantee a strengthening of the base of the construction industry and construction materials, whose chronic lag is already making itself felt and in the next few years will become a stumbling block in implementing the tasks before us. By resolving this, we will truly ensure the fulfillment of the social program and tasks in the priority sectors of the national eonomy. We hope that the USSR Gosplan and the relevant government bodies will give considerably more attention to all these questions.

Comrades! The debate that has developed after the report shows yet again that the conference delegates are discussing the vital problems of restructuring with a great sense of responsibility. We can note with satisfaction that none of us has any doubt about the central question—the need for the party's leading and organizing role in the new conditions.

The party will not, and will never hand over the role of political vanguard to anyone—that is axiomatic. At the same time, it is obviously impossible to lead through the old methods. Therefore, we support the innovative, profoundly creative approach of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, which is designed to resolve this and other urgent tasks.

Today, as always at crucial turning points in history, the monolithic unity of party ranks is important. The delegates from the Ukrainian party organization totally support the political line of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo, as well as the propositions and tasks set out in Comrade Gorbachev's report, which seek to deepen restructuring. (Applause)

Fedotova on Education

PM0207115188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by S.A. Fedotova, teacher at School No 130 in Perm, at the 29 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Dear Comrades! We have heard many definitions of the importance of our forum from this rostrum today. Of all these definitions, I would highlight the one contained in the report—a fateful event.

Indeed, our fate is being decided today. Our fate, and that of our children and those who will carry on our cause. There is no place for lyrical deviations in the furious stream of truth. And yet, perhaps because I am a teacher, seeking the way not only to people's minds but to their hearts, I will take the risk of reading some lines of poetry from this lofty rostrum to characterize the essence of what is happening: "This time hums like a telegraph wire, this heart is at one with the truth." This is indeed true, the heart of each of us, which is searching so sensitively, acutely, and painfully at times for just such a truth and which responds to the quest for truth.

I have been working in schools for almost 25 years. Comparing and contrasting, I can state with total justification that every day since April 1985 has been like a pulse enlivening our complex human organism. And the heart providing this growing and accelerating pace of activity is the Communist Party.

It is difficult, complicated, and sometimes painful to cure chronic ailments, but there is no alternative. And the surest means of purifying and renewing our life is democratization, about which so much has been said. On behalf of the Perm delegation and the oblast's working people I support the spirit and thrust of the democratization process that has begun and the ideas of democratization that run through all the propositions of the report—the notion of delineating and precisely defining the functions of party and soviet organs, and the idea of limiting the tenure of any post to two terms of office. Comrade Ulyanov has just spoken and said that "one does not change horses in midstream," and yet I think two terms are quite sufficient. Mikhail Sergeyevich still has enough time to do what has been proposed, and we will help him in that. (Applause)

M.S. Gorbachev: I've already said, let's not think about those sitting here and those who aren't here, but about the country, the party, and the people. We must work out correct solutions. And these correct solutions will put everything in its proper place. Otherwise, we'll find ourselves getting sidetracked on to what is most convenient for whom.

S.A. Fedotova: The idea of democratization is of great concern to all—probably to schools most of all. Perhaps because for public education, which I am representing here, democracy is indeed the clear and fresh air, which is all that schools can and must breathe. Only under conditions of complete democratization can schools complete their social task of educating creative individuals and modern-thinking, active citizens.

The complex and uncompromising period of spiritual cleansing is fully recognized by our country's teachers, just as they realize their own supreme responsibility to society. Schools and teachers were given a mandate of special trust at the Central Committee February Plenum. What should teachers be like to make others follow them? The title "teacher" subsumes all the following

qualities: concern with great events, the passion of a propagandist, the inspiration of a poet, the intellect of a researcher, a lively mind, and a simplicity of spiritual and intellectual motivation that can relate to the trusting and searching views and hearts of children.

We have the authorization of the times, and have been accorded the honor of bearing the lofty ideals of communism beyond the horizon of the 20th century. However, it is not easy for teachers to put this lofty mission of hero, fighter, and key figure in restructuring into practice.

Least of all here, at the party conference, would I want to talk about the in-house problems we teachers face. School affairs, though, are a most important party matter. And there are issues whose resolution is vital not only to schools, but to society as a whole. A speech by a teacher with a different speciality would probably be calmer. But I am a history teacher. And you can understand my pain, suffering, and occasional shame when I am forced to say that the history textbook covers such-and-such a question wrongly, another has been distorted, and another does not correspond to historical truth.

Today and probably even tomorrow we will be forced to study our country's history—an important educational subject—from newspaper and journal articles. These, too, are subjective at times and even contradictory at others when covering the most important problems of the past and the future—especially the stages of socialist construction and the definition of the role and essence of society's political system.

Such a humanized discipline as sociology has been deprived almost completely of the existence of human passions and vivid pictures of life woven from people's struggle for ideas. For more than 15 years I have been head of a rayon methodological association of history and sociology teachers. How many times on the eve of the new academic year have we received instructions to change the syllabus regarding a certain history, sociology, or law course! This constant changing of educational syllabuses leaves no time or room for their creative interpretation by teachers. We are in dire need of a new syllabus and new textbooks on social disciplines.

We realize that these programs must be drawn up by scholars together with practical teachers. And this must be done as soon as possible. However, we need historical truth first and foremost. This is where I agree with Comrade Karpov: The truth is not only bitter but mobilizing. We need assessments that are well balanced and competent, we need a comprehensive analysis of historical processes and an objective and modern interpretation of them. (Applause)

All this is becoming exceptionally important in work with the younger generation. After all, we are most concerned and alarmed about the moral health and civic stance of our young people.

In preparing our oblast aktiv meeting, a poll of 10th graders was taken in the oblast's rayons and cities. And we were alarmed by the students' correct but knee-jerk and declarative answers to the questions of what it means to be a fighter for restructuring, and how they view their role in the restructuring of educational establishments. From this we can conclude that the youngsters had not formed an active civic stance or recognized the need for independent and useful practical action.

Nor can one fail to note today the manifestations of skepticism and the devaluation of such lasting values as ideological conviction, Soviet patriotism, and enthusiasm for labor. Schools cannot avoid bearing the responsibility, but they cannot cope with these problems alone. The fostering of creative initiative in young people must be backed up by the entire activity of society, creative unions, the mass media, and social organizations.

The Komsomol plays a special and exceptionally important part in this. On the whole, Komsomol organizations are engaged in questing. I saw this for myself yet again recently at a meeting with the Komsomol aktiv and young people. At the same time, there was concern everywhere at the modest place allotted to young people and their political organization in the Theses for the party conference. That concern is reasonable. The Komsomol has always played a special role among social organizations. It is our reserve. And we have all been through this Komsomol school. Perhaps today we should think about another resolution at our conference—a separate resolution on young people's problems and the enhancement of the role of the Lenin Komsomol as a political organization in society's life. (Applause)

The family, too, should be a close ally of the schools in education. After all, the foundations of the personality are laid in the family. The modern family is undergoing great tests, and one cannot fail to see in our sociocultural makeup a serious breakdown of family life, the consignment of popular traditions to oblivion, and the lack of societal contempt or condemnation for those who abandon their children. In this we need the help of party, soviet, and trade union organs—help which, regrettably, is still not forthcoming in practice. It is most important that we pool the efforts of labor collectives, schools, and families and channel them into the fostering of moral and humanistic principles.

Schools, though, should be at the center of the young generation's formation, and far greater attention should be devoted to our schools. It cannot be said that there have been no changes in our schools. There have been improvements, particularly since the February plenum. I can also make this judgment on the basis of the development of public education in our oblast. Changes are taking place in the content of schoolwork, we have experience in musical and aesthetic education, and education-production associations are up and running. Even in my own school the innovations have been surprising by the standards of the past: A school television center

has been established, we have switched to a 5-day week in the lower grades, and have introduced a classification [zachetnyy] system in the senior grades. However, these crumbs of innovation are dwarfed by the vast expanses of old dogmatic approaches. The decisions of party organs are implemented only slowly, especially where the provision of a material and technical base for schools is concerned. The fundamentally new system for running public education is not being implemented in practice. As the provision on base enterprises is not working, the new law on the socialist enterprise again found no room for it. At the same time, though, school life cannot depend simply on the maturity and conscientiousness of enterprise leaders, their desire or reluctance to educate young people and train new workers, or their understanding or lack of understanding of how advantageous it is to invest in public education.

Thus, we could probably argue with Comrade Chazov over which is more advantageous—investing in health care or investing in education. I think that if we resolved all this together and united a healthy body with a healthy spirit and a healthy mind, we could probably move mountains. (Applause)

The problem of the relationship between schools and base enterprises is especially aggravated now, because production sectors are being switched to economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing. Money must be accounted for, but it would be immoral to divide up children in kindergartens into our own and others, it would be uneconomical to refuse to acquire computers for schools, and it would be apolitical to dodge the needs of schools and the problems of the younger generation under the slogan of economic accountability. One hears certain leaders glibly sharing their experience of switching to self-recoupment through the creation of privately financed [platnyy] circles and sections for children, and one marvels at what commerce can achieve! But what about children from low-income families or children whose parents prefer the bottle above all other spiritual needs—what are they to do? How can they enroll into this system where everything must be paid for?

I am not objecting; we must watch our money. But will we not end up in a situation whereby the kopeks and rubles accounted for and acquired today will turn into far more serious losses tomorrow? It is time to implement in practical terms Lenin's demands for a careful and caring attitude to teachers and their right to creativity. Showing constant interest in the work of teachers, and stressing the social importance of their role and vocation, Vladimir Ilich Lenin repeatedly drew attention to the fact that teaching, by its very nature and educational goals, is always linked with party work. That is why teachers "must be closely linked with the party and its ideas, and must be imbued with its spirit." The role of the Soviet teacher has always been defined as that of proponent of the party's ideas. The words "Soviet teacher" are synonymous with the words "nonparty Bolshevik." So let us give them the opportunity to be members of the Communist Party.

While the CPSU Central Committee Theses were being discussed, Communists demanded an end to regulated entry into the party on the basis of social classification: workers, employees, or intellectuals. Teachers, who are intellectuals, educate workers, employees, and those who will perform mental labor. So give teachers the right—if they are worthy of it—to become Communist Party members without any restrictions and implement the lofty goals of the Communist Party. (Applause)

Bondarev Criticizes Press

PM0107142188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 3, 4

[Speech by Yu.V. Bondarev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Writers Union Board, at the 29 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Dear Comrades! There is no point in our razing the old world to its foundations, and there is no need for us to trample the millet that someone has sown with the sweat of his brow. We must not use the high efficiency of modern bulldozers to destroy the foundations of a palace that has yet to be built, forgetting that our main objective is to redesign the floor plan. We do not need to build a biblical Tower of Babel just to destroy it, or rather to see it destroy itself like the never-materialized brotherhood of people who have failed to understand one another. There is no need for us to destroy our past to build our future. We oppose the idea of having our reason reduced to the lowest form of awareness, and our passion being reduced to nothing more than doubts. We do not need people to be guinea pigs, resignedly submitting to the laboratory scalpel of history. Having launched restructuring, we want to see before us the still-unknown beauty of nature, of the whole world, of events, and of things, and we want to save the popular culture of all nations from unfair trial. We are against our society becoming a crowd of solitary people, a voluntary captive in the trap of commercialist consumerism that promises the luxurious life of alien, all-pervasive advertising. We know only too well that that life—and we have but one life to live—tastes salty and bitter. We know this, as most civilized people have grown accustomed to the taste of sweets from childhood.

We know something that is inevitable and sad: We all have come to this world in order to leave it forever. We also know something joyful: Life itself is a boon. However, living one's life is not like a simple stroll across a field. Indeed, the sonic boom of history is rolling over our heads. April, the month of spring and expectations, brought us an awareness of the need to act, but the time has now come for everyone to interpret the historical logic of the abiding laws of development.

Could our restructuring be compared to an aircraft that has taken off without knowing if there is a landing strip at its destination? Despite all the debates, despite the arguments about democracy and the expansion of glasnost, despite the reopening of cesspools, there is only one way we can ensure our invincibility: through agreement on the moral objective of restructuring; in other words, restructuring for the sake of the material prosperity and spiritual unification of all. Only when there is agreement to build a landing strip at the destination. Only when there is agreement. I asked a young machine operator recently about the changes in his life, and this was his reply: "You ask me what has changed? Here is the restructuring of thinking that has taken place on our sovkhoz: Whoever was a fool has become clever, shouting slogans; whoever was clever seems to have become an utter fool, keeping silent and frightened of the newspapers. Do you know the difference between a man and a fly now? Both a fly and a man can be swatted by a newspaper. I said this aloud, and was dubbed an opponent of restructuring." In this exceptionally venomous answer, spiced with folk humor, I sensed both the annoyance and the malice of someone who is disappointed by what is nothing but the semblance of reforms in his work. However, I also sensed that a section of our press has perceived, or rather exploited, restructuring as a means for the destabilization of all that exists, for the revision of faith and morality.

Recently, and adapting to our credulity, even some serious papers set an example of infectious consistency and gave keen attention to the knights of extremism, of snap reaction overflowing with quick-tempered militancy, and of intolerance in the struggle to restructure the past and the present, raising doubts about everything: morality, courage, love, art, talent, the family, the great revolutionary ideas, Lenin's genius, the October Revolution, and the Great Patriotic War. And this section of nihilistic criticism is becoming, or may have already become, the driving force in the press, as the writers say, molding public opinion, stunning readers and viewers with sensationalist noise and abuse, and juggling with and distorting historical facts.

This criticism is convinced that its time has come to hold complete sway over politics in literature, and over people's fates and souls, turning them at times into nothing but empty shells.

The extremists have been quite successful in their strategy which, incidentally, was born not out of chaos but out of a position that had been worked out thoroughly in advance. And now this has largely undermined confidence in history, in almost the entire past, in the older generation, in man's inner honor, which is called conscience, in justice, and in objective glasnost, which occasionally turns into biased glasnost—the accused has no right to reply.

The immorality of the press cannot teach morality to others. Immorality in ideology results in perversion of the spirit. Perhaps not everyone in the chief editors' offices at our newspapers and journals fully realizes—or perhaps they are unwilling to fully realize—that glasnost and democracy mean lofty moral and civic discipline and not arbitrary actions according to Ivan Karamazov's philosophy (Applause), that the revolutionary feelings of restructuring stem from moral convictions and not from the poison offered as a cure. We no longer have any explanation of differences, any quest for objective truth, any arguments about truth, which is still under lock and key, debate, discovery of young talents, or unification on the basis of the idea of transforming our society. What we have is a battle from opposing positions, the erosion of criteria and moral tenets, squabbles among and defamation of major writers, movie directors, and artists, and verbal and written rivalry between such remarkable talents as Vasiliy Belov, Viktor Astafyev, Petr Proskurin, Valentin Rasputin, Anatoliy Ivanov, Mikhail Alekseyev, Sergey Bondarchuk, and Ilya Glazunov. Uninhibited actions calculated to capture a particular group of newspapers and journals—these extermist tactics and strategies have been demonstrated in a particularly clear way in the past year, and are already generating serious fears among many people.

Our press, which destroys, denigrates, and throws into the cesspool our past life and experience, our national relics, the peoples' sacrifices during the Patriotic War, and the traditions of culture, in other words, tries to wipe memory, faith, and hope from people's awareness—this press is erecting an ugly monument to thoughtlessness, to the iconoclasts of thought, pure feelings, and conscience, and the history of ideology will record this with shame and condemnation, just as we recall the epistolary style of 1937 and 1949.

It is doubly incomprehensible that when words like "fatherland," "motherland," or "patriotism" are spoken aloud, the response takes the form of some serpentine hissing, reeking of readiness to strike and bite: "chauvinism," "Black Hundreds attitudes."

When I read in our press that the Russians did not and do not have their own territory, that 60- and 70-year-old veterans of war and labor are potential opponents of restructuring, that the time has come for Sholokhov's works to be deleted from school curriculums and replaced by "Children of the Arbat," when I read that the journals NASH SOVREMENNIK and MOLODAYA GVARDIYA are implanting hatred in the genes (you must really have a natural hatred for these journals in order to write things like this), when people try to persuade me in print that stability is the most terrifying thing that can happen (in other words, long live disorganization and chaos in the economy and in culture), that the writer Bulgakov was hounded to death by the "Leader" [Vozhd] rather than by a group of critics and literary figures headed by Bill-Belotserkovskiy, who repeatedly demanded that their most talented competitor be exiled abroad, when OGONEK prints provocative temptations encouraging a demarcation of forces and the ranging of the entire Moscow writers' organization

against the journal MOSKVA, when I read that fascism apparently emerged early this century in Russia rather than in Italy, when I hear that General Vlasov, who betrayed the army he commanded and went over to the Germans, was struggling against Stalin and not against the Soviet people, when I think of all this irresponsibility during my meetings with young people, I am no longer amazed by the questions they ask—questions imbued with a lack of faith, irony, and a certain despair. And I think to myself: Yes, at times just a gram of faith is more precious than all the experience of a wise man. (Applause) And I realize that we are somehow betraying our young people, devastating their souls with the scalpel of anarchic chatter, vacuous sensationalism, all kinds of alien fashions, and cheap demagogic flirtations.

In our press, we offer young people neither the truth, even the most bitter truth, nor the experience that shows how to set many things right. Rather, we offer an endless chain of disappointments spiced with the poison of cynicism, which extinguishes the healthy joyfulness of youth. We say: Bitter experience, as there is no sweet experience in nature. But experience is life's tutor. Are we not replacing it with vulgar vacuousness and absurdities? Are we not already looking at the sun and the sky through the prism of ruble notes earned as a result of increased print runs? (Applause)

I often think about what motivated one young person to address these words to the older generation: "Could it be that you have not yet realized we have already routed you? All mass media, television, videos, radio, and the press, are in our hands. You are being smashed and beaten every day. It is time to switch off your oxygen supply. Our time has come."

Extremist criticism, with its despotism, lack of culture, lust for power, and cynicism in its assessment of events, seems to be above and beyond the interests of socialist progress. It wants to claim for itself the new title of "foreman of restructuring." However, in actual fact, it preaches its main postulate: Let all weeds bloom and all evil forces contend; only with chaos, confusion, muddle, intrigues, and an epidemic of literary scandals, only by shaking faith will we be able to cobble together a uniform thinking that suits us personally. Yes, this criticism lusts for power and, casting off morals and conscience, may bring ideology to the brink of crisis.

I still hope that with effort and persistence, it may be possible to consolidate our literary forces. At the same time, though, I know how some writer colleagues, both at meetings in the salons of publishing houses and at their lectures on Russian culture abroad, heap stinking dirt on our past and present, on dead classics and modern writers, how they lie and slander in their efforts to gain affection through "truthful lies," ingratiating themselves by going into raptures about those suffering in a "barbarian country." Knowing this, I can understand those who have been slandered and no longer wish to remain in the same party or the same Writers Union with them.

Like a most detailed analysis, restructuring has revealed who is who and who was waiting for what, placidly living in the calm of stagnation while others were preparing changes.

In the most democratic Ancient Greece, it was six black beans, indicating six votes against, that sealed the death sentence on Socrates, the greatest philosopher of all times and all peoples. It was demagoguery, slander, the clamor of liars and the deceived, and the perfidy of the envious that tipped the scales of justice. The best, the outstanding directors and actors were not voted on to the secretariat or the board at the last congress of the Union of Cinematography Workers. What was the deciding factor here? Group bias, general nervousness, envy of talent and other people's success?

At the last artists congress, it was the most outstanding artists, masters of world renown, who gathered the largest number of "black beans," as it were, when the board was being elected. What was the unfair deciding factor there? General hysteria to overthrow recognized authorities, the triumph of modernism for modernism's sake? A merciless struggle was also waged in the twenties. Slapping public taste in the face and destroying traditions, great geniuses and great talents ranging from Pushkin to Yesenin, from Andrey Rublev to Surikov, were being "cast overboard from the ship of modernity." Polished and consistent persecution hounded two tremendous poets—Yesenin and Ayakovskiy—to death, just as the careers of Mikhail Sarev and Anatoliy Efros have come to a sudden end through our extremism and obscurantism in the eighties.

A few days ago, in an article on trust, a famous writer seemed to be fair in insisting that the chief editors of journals be replaced every 5 years, since (and I quote) "the same old ossification and stagnation result even when an editor may have the best personal qualities." I take the liberty of objecting to my colleague's opinion, as I am profoundly and unwaveringly convinced that whether ossification develops or not, it still depends on the editor's personal qualities. There was no need to reelect either Nekrasov (SOVREMENNIK), or Saltykov-Shchedrin (OTECHESTVENNYYE ZAPISKI), or Simonov, or Tvardovskiy (NOVYY MIR) every 5 years. Mechanical procedures are not a sign of democracy.

The infantry field manual, with its rigid paragraphs and demands for unquestioning action in combat, is good for the Army, but only as guidance for action and not as dogma. To copy the system for electing major enterprise leaders, as my colleague suggests, would entail a disregard for the specific features of literature.

I am well acquainted with Sergey Vasilyevich Vikulov, chief editor of the journal NASH SOVREMENNIK. He is a talented, honest, and modest person who may be more in love with and devoted to his publication than his own job. Without him the journal would lack soul, the breath of life, and the everlasting energy which, by the

way, laid the foundation for restructuring in debates, articles, and arguments. While that was going on, other press organs—meaning no insult to them—were still timidly feeling their way toward restructuring. At the same time, I cannot imagine, for example, the replacement, retirement, or resignation of someone like Viktor Ivanovich Shtepo, general director of Volgograd Oblast's "Volgo-Don" Association, a contemporary of ours who is amazing in every respect, and whose economic management methods could be the envy of any entrepreneur in the world. People like him are the salt of our earth. (Applause)

Freedom is man's supreme moral state, when limitations are necessary as manifestations of that very morality, in other words of reasonable self-esteem and respect for your neighbor. Is this not the meaning of our transformations?

China has the ancient term "shu," which encompasses both universal meaning and national dignity—something Western culture can learn from. It means an ability to respect and love man for the fact that he is on earth; to love and protect the water, the wind, the sky, and every blade of grass at the roadside. Yes, feelings generate ideas and, conversely, ideas nurture feelings.

In the last few years Russia has become a heavy but necessary part of my life. I sense in the motherland a growing yearning for a renewed motherland. Thank you for listening. (Applause)

Krasnodar Chief Polozkov

PM0307153988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Krasnodar CPSU Kraykom, at the 29 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union Party Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade delegates, out of the wide range of very important problems presented for discussion at our conference I would like to touch on just three.

First, we must thoroughly investigate how restructuring is going and what is most responsible for holding it up today. It has already been said here, said repeatedly, that restructuring is under way. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report made an in-depth and thorough analysis of the processes of restructuring, and comrades have cited quite a few arguments in support of this in their speeches.

Society is changing; it has started moving. Labor collectives are mastering new management methods. Links in the agroindustrial complex are successfully working in our kray under conditions of self-financing and self-capitalization. The lease contract and in-farm accounting have made a good start in the countryside and the basic tasks of the 5-year plan are being carried out a little ahead of schedule.

State statistics could be cited to corroborate this. But it is they that worry us most, for they show overall small increases rather than a breakthrough in the most important areas of our life, although more than 2 years have passed since the 27th party congress.

One sometimes suspects that the restructuring process is for the time being a matter of initiative and is not in the least mandatory for many people. Enthusiasts have been found in the persons of plant directors, kolkhoz chairmen, sovkhoz directors, and the creators of labor collectives; they have enlisted the support of party raykoms, have inspired collectives, and are doing great work despite a host of unpleasantnesses and obstacles from various quarters. They demonstrate that restructuring is the right course, can yield good results, and, most importantly, can do so quickly. We have quite a few such initiators in our kray, the majority being in the countryside.

But the following question is asked today: Haven't we in fact been unable to convince people of the need for restructuring? I would not say that myself. People believe in restructuring, they want it, they want real results and quickly. The point is that we have not been able to rouse people to action.

In reality, the introduction of the economic mechanism is lagging badly. The legal basis of restructuring is not geared toward resourceful, creative work, inquiry, and independence. We are making a thorough mess of introducing the ideology of renewal into people's minds, and it has not become the driving force of restructuring today.

The party Central Committee's line is embodied in fine, truly revolutionary documents. But the fact is that today, as in former times, many of them are not being carried out. Moreover, when they land up in the old bureaucratic apparatus they are emasculated and undermined by all manner of addenda. People have already spoken here about how many interpretations of the Law on the State Enterprise have been issued. Absolutely nothing is left out: planning, sale of goods, staffing, various kinds of departmental normatives, labor renumeration, and so forth.

An equally bitter fate has befallen the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers' 20 March 1986 resolution on the agroindustrial committee, since it has been "saddled" with 34 circulars, leaving little of substance remaining of this real restructuring document. One could cite such examples ad infinitum. Another equally important factor is that in breaking the outmoded economic mechanism what we have taking place

is not a search for a new and more effective one but for the time being merely a changing of labels on the offices of the upper echelons of management. Territorial main administrations are trying to rename themselves production associations. The budgetary apparatus is made economically accountable, and this is passed off as a reduction in the apparatus. Think about it: What will change in the work of furniture enterprises, particularly regarding the shortage of furniture from the Ministry of the Forestry Industry (Comrade M.I. Busygin) as a result of changing the name of its "Mebelyug" main administration to the "Mebelyug" territorial production association. (Laughter. Applause) Let us say bluntly that this kind of restructuring will give nothing extra to the people. And the ministries' current resistance to creating intersectoral complexes has to be seen to be believed!

Now one more aspect of the problem: We continue to persistently and stubbornly call many thousands of industrial conglomerates labor collectives. Yet that is where property has lost its owner in the recent past, individuality has been diluted, moral and ethical ties have ceased to operate, and discipline has been lost.

Take construction, for example. A composite team working on contract has decided and will decide the fate of both project and plan. But it is the team that has yet to find a place in all the restructuring documents. Its recognition as a labor collective and a legal entity is stubbornly refused and it is is not allowed to work according to an agreement [dogovor], according to a contract. The existing construction and installation administrations, trusts, associations, main administrations, ministries, and large managerial apparatus which have no economic link with the team do not allow it to work normally.

Yet the recently created highly enterprising cooperatives, with 5 times fewer people and a 40 times smaller managerial apparatus than construction and installation administrations, are doing virtually the same amount of work.

I think this is where it is necessary to seek answers to the following questions, too: Why are the collective contract, economic accountability, temporary scientific centers, and design bureaus working on a specific task not making headway in shops, sections, and teams in industry, transport, the services sphere, and science?

Of course, a revolution is not made with decrees. Precise recommendations from science on, say, the setting up of new production structures and their links with labor collectives are needed if our economy is to operate at full throttle. Other incentive measures for sectoral staffs are needed. Yet there are no energetic measures visible from most union and republic ministries at this stage.

The fact that the present ministries are themselves incapable of embarking on crucial transformations is becoming increasingly evident. For them this is tantamount to winding themselves up. CPSU Central Committee sectoral departments have also proved incapable of overcoming this conservatism. They, in my opinion, have not even tried to resist it. (Applause)

Forces located outside the interests of ministries, outside the existing apparatus, are necessary for the restructuring of the national economy. Groups of Central Committee members, scientists, leaders of enterprises, Supreme Soviet commissions, and representatives of public organizations could act as such.

The second question I would like to touch on is the full restoration of power to the soviets—one of the main thrusts of democratization of our state, as was stressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his report. Yes, the work of soviets is indeed overformalized, their rights have been reduced while their duties are constantly increasing. The activity of the apparatus gives rise to much censure from the population.

Now that the extent of cadres' responsibility to the people is changing, let us look truth straight in the eye. Krasnodar Kray Soviet, representing a population of more than 5 million, can itself resolve nothing today. It cannot change the management structure of the organs subordinate to it, assign a plot of land for industrial or social needs, or reallocate quotas for material resources in the light of prevailing circumstances. It is not even entitled to establish an additional nurse's post in a rayon hospital. Moscow has assumed responsibility for everything. Its budget is drawn up in the Ministry of Finance, its state orders come from the ministries, and what is to be constructed and where is decided at the Gosplan. At soviet sessions we annually discuss the plans for socioeconomic development of the region, which the central departments give us 6 months or more after their own sessions. As for settlement and rural soviets, they are—let us be frank—completely without rights today.

As stated in the report, questions of the decentralization of power, the transfer to local level of functions concerning local self-management, and the comprehensive resolution of social and other problems of the population must be resolved legislatively.

It is our profound conviction that initiative and all economic life in the country can be considerably enlivened by switching the regions to self-sufficiency. The established system of centralized distribution of output gives rise to freeloading and stifles local initiative. It is now more advantageous to sit on the centrally assigned allowance and wait for a shovel handle, a cast-iron frying pan, mustard, or toothpaste to be brought into the kray. If you show initiative, you will at once be punished.

Here are some examples. A very acute problem arose in the kray last year with regard to school uniforms. The krayispolkom was forced to adopt the headstrong decision to have them made out of cloth that was available in the trade and consumer services spheres. The Ministry of Trade at once redistributed these uniforms to Bashkiria and to Novosibirsk, Ulyanovsk, and other oblasts, leaving an insignificant number in the kray and not, of course, making good the enterprises' losses running into millions of rubles.

During the past 2 years meat procurements in the kray increased by more than 100,000 tonnes, and milk procurements by 140,000 tonnes, and production of other agricultural products increased. However, supplies to the local population did not improve. I could cite many such examples which discourage people from working more actively and seeking reserves. The center knows about them. These abnormal phenomena can only be ruled out by changing the planning system and very quickly assimilating wholesale trade in material resources. I believe that the state order for consumer goods could initially be increased to the volume of, say, 70 percent of the existing potential, while the soviets could be permitted to use 30 percent and all above-plan output at their discretion, including exchanging them with other territories on a mutually advantageous basis. There would be considerably more goods and foodstuffs, and a better life would be led not by those who know how to ask the state insistently for something but by those who work better.

And the final question: During the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses, Communists and nonparty people in our kray were unanimous that only the Communist Party can be be the chief guarantor of restructuring and the prime mover of social progress under present conditions. What role is allocated to it in society; how are the functions of party, soviet, and economic organs to be demarcated; how are its relations with other public structures to be organized; how are the problems which have accumulated in internal party life to be resolved; and, finally, how is its shaken prestige among the people to be raised, how are guarantees to be created for the prevention of the various kinds of mistakes which have happened in our past, and, generally, how are we to live better in the future? It is the firm conviction of the delegation from the Krasnodar Kray party organization that the Central Committee set forth in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report a clear, precise, and detailed program. We fully share it and will vote unanimously for it.

Party committees are being justifiably criticized for supplanting soviet and economic organs and for working methods based on administration and pressure. But what else can they do today, when it is necessary to work considerably better but when there is, after all, no one for the time being to share this right with?

In speaking about the soviets I have tried to show you that they have no rights today. But there are no other organs in the kray or region. People go to party committees on literally every question and demand specific decisions from them. What, then, can we who pressure, dictate, and administer do today? Comrades who criticize, do give us a hint. (Applause)

The truth is that today many party cadres, who have for years relied on technocratic methods, are not ready to work in a different way. We select for the party apparatus, as has already been stressed, not political commissars but industrial, construction, and trade workers. Look at the CPSU Central Committee apparatus structure: In its departments are represented not only ministries and main administrations but their subsectors. This in many respects predetermines the structure and style of work of party kraykoms, obkoms, and raykoms. We fully support the proposal of withdrawing from the structure of the party apparatus on a sectoral principle.

People are rightly saying that there is a need to enhance the standard of work of primary party organizations. A very great deal is being said about it, but we are for the time being doing little. Despite the obvious need to reduce the party apparatus, I think that we must strengthen rayon party committees. They are the front line and leading edge in contact with people. They are the organ which works in the area where all the interests of people are very closely intertwined. In the main we have cadres with little experience working there. Thought must be given to the salary of this category of party workers. The fact is that they, like soviet workers of that level, are today one of the lowest paid in the country. (Applause)

Work with cadres is and will be the the main question for any political organization at any time. The cadre policy elaborated at the Central Committee January (1987) Plenum is already bearing fruit. But there is not as yet, frankly, any systematic or integrated grasp of the problem. Work with cadres must be placed on a firm footing. Haphazard development of such a key link in the party leadership as cadres is unacceptable. We consider it essential that party committees have cadre policy departments.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report talks well about the fundamental principle of CPSU life and activity that is democratic centralism. But, it seemed to me, only in the first part. Democratization and discipline never have and never will be mutually exclusive. The more extensively the processes of democratization develop, the more organized and monolithic the party must be, and Communists must be more disciplined when a decision is made by the majority. We propose that this section be expressed more precisely in the resolution on the report; otherwise, our party's actions will not be united and its words will not carry weight. That cannot be allowed. (Applause)

Mironenko on Youth Problems

PM0107180188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 4, 5

["Speech by Comrade V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee," at the 29 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! I am going to talk about young people, although you will understand how difficult it is for me to do so after the somewhat gloomy picture, to put it mildly, just painted by my favorite writer, Yuriy Vasilyevich Bondarev. However, I am glad he spoke before me. I am glad because, to be frank, I was afraid that youth problems would be dwarfed by the "Everests" of economic and political problems this time, too, as has happened so often in the past, even after what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in the report and the comments of Svetlana Aleksandrovna Fedotova, the teacher from Perm. I am deeply convinced that neither political, economic, nor spiritual problems can be correctly understood, let alone correctly resolved, without a consideration of this most important and, in revolutionary times, decisive factor—the position of young people.

Young people have supported restructuring. For the first time in many years, the activeness of young people is increasing in real deeds rather than fine words. Tens of millions of young people took part in the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses. Comrades, just think, this was essentially a referendum of political confidence among young people. And the result of that referendum is clear. The confidence of young people in the party has grown and the situation has become clearer, more honest, and more truthful. That is true, of course, but it is not the whole truth. The situation among our youth is complex and contradictory. Political apathy, distrust, and open deception remain. Some young people are held in thrall of the revolutionary phrase. In my view, the reasons for all this go considerably deeper than juvenile maximalism or political inexperience, and considerably deeper than what Yuriy Vasilyevich Bondarev was talking about. We often hear the criticism that young people are screaming, screaming from the "stairs on the 12th floor," [reference to Soviet television program on young people's problems], screaming from the stage with a guitar in their hands, but we never wonder why they are screaming. Man screams. When he is born he screams from physical pain, when he becomes an individual he screams from spiritual asphyxiation, from social pain, or from the inability or lack of opportunity to express himself in labor, creative work, or sociopolitical life.

First, young people suffered most from the stagnation in society. On the other hand, our society began to lose its dynamism precisely because there had been a slackening of the influx of fresh forces, innovative ideas, and new people; in other words, everything that young people bring with them as they embark on life.

Second, and this must also be said honestly at the party conference today, the Komsomol is emerging from its precrisis situation in the mid-eighties much more slowly than we would like and more slowly than we believed it could.

Third, despite the measures taken since the 27th CPSU Congress, the overall social tension among young people is not declining. Mikhail Sergeyevich is right—there must be a strong integrated youth policy, and the Leninist principles of the party leadership of the Komsomol must be restored.

In this context, I would also like to express a number of specific ideas and proposals which, in our view, deserve the support of the conference—either by a separate resolution, as Comrade Fedotova proposed, or as a last resort in one of the resolutions proposed by the Politburo.

The true participation of young people in making the decisions that affect their vital interests must be ensured on every level—from the labor collective through to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the CPSU Central Committee. For this, we must considerably expand the representation of young people in every organ of state power and probably in party organs, too, including the party Central Committee, where there is only a handful of young Communists. Incidentally, the age structure of the delegates to our conference is indicative: Out of 5,000 delegates, there are 158 people under 30 years of age, and just 47 Komsomol workers who are Communists working in the Komsomol.

Obviously, it would be nice if this representation were achieved naturally. However, all our experience indicates that definite guarantees are essential here. Therefore, I support the proposal on the direct representation of young people in the USSR Supreme Soviet. I propose that an amendment or addition be made to the Constitution to enshrine both this provision and the special attitude of the state and society to the upbringing of the coming generation, as well as the responsibility to the people and state for the deliberate or involuntary harm done to this nationwide cause. This amendment can be developed and concretized in the Law on Youth, which is being prepared. There is an obvious, crying need to protect society's interests in the training of future generations against departmentalism, bureaucracy, and technocratic tendencies and political shortsightedness, which have more than once in our history sacrificed the future to immediate political expediency or economic advantage.

Second, and perhaps most important: What awaits us is not a land of milk and honey, but the inevitable difficulties of the transition period. In these conditions, young people will be in an area of heightened social risk, but we cannot back down now. Approximately 4 million young families are waiting in line for housing in the country. Some 1.5 million applications for places in kindergartens

and creches have not been met. The provision of hostels for small families meets just 15 percent of demand. Many young families simply live apart for many years.

However, there are problems that are even more serious. Young people could solve their problems through their own labor and initiative. But the average monthly wage for young workers is 1.5 times lower than that of the rest of the population. We have become so accustomed to this that we consider it quite normal. Yet this is wage leveling in the form of remuneration not for labor or intellectual contribution, but for the office held, length of service, production experience, and so on. And, Comrades, life itself corrects us every day. This difference is ultimately returned to those same young people in the form of help from older relatives. And I tell you frankly: Adults can feed their children until they draw their pensions if they want. But that is not the point. The point is that this is where the most powerful brake on the acceleration of socioeconomic development is hidden. This is where parasitism, lack of initiative, and childishness have their roots. This is where the vast and untapped potential of physical and creative forces so necessary to restructuring lie.

I do not understand how the Council of Ministers, the Gosplan, and the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems can fail to see this absolutely obvious distortion. In our view, what can and should be done now? First, we must support a number of social measures included in the Law on Youth, which is now being drafted, and we must find the resources to implement them. Second, the USSR State Committee for Statistics, the USSR Gosplan, and the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau on Social Development must create the requisite subdivisions to help compile plans for the country's social and economic development and the state budget at all stages of their preparation, and must try to take the interests of the young generation into account.

Third, a young people's fund must be created from the resources of social organizations and state resources for the implementation of long-term programs and prompt measures to improve the social condition of young people and provide the initial funding for their most interesting social initiatives. For example, there is now an urgent need for social and medical help to wounded internationalist servicemen. Komsomol organizations and thousands of individuals have been contributing money to a social inventions fund established by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. However, we need rehabilitation centers, artificial limbs, wheelchairs, and many other things quickly, not in 2 or 3 years' time.

We must also think of ways to alleviate or compensate for the definite inequality, partly inevitable under socialism, facing young people from different social backgrounds at the start of their lives.

The Komsomol itself, with the backing of the state and other social organizations, is willing and able to do much to ensure that each person's abilities and hard work, and not his parents' home or material and official position, largely determine his opportunity to continue his education and achieve the appropriate position in society and material sufficiency. Comrades, this is not utopia; it is a perfectly feasible task.

The Komsomol-supported movement of young people's housing complexes, the system of young people's scientific and technical creativity, computer clubs, labor associations, and much else—these are nothing but links in a single flexible system designed to seek out and support talented and hardworking young people.

Real opportunity at the start of your path in life means relying on your own efforts.

It is equally probable, I think, that a Korolev or a Shostakovich could be born into the family of an academic or the family a worker or kolkhoz member. However, the opportunities to develop their skills are not the same.

I am no longer talking about the fact that many parents, including Communists, unfortunately, have taken the slogan "All the Best for the Children" to mean in its slightly amended form "All the Best for My Children." We must combat favoritism or, if you will forgive me, "string-pulling" when it comes to admission to a VUZ, or to a job, and so on. We must realize that either we overcome it or it will overcome us and, like weeds, engulf everything vital and healthy in society and the youth sector.

Comrades, even in the capitalist countries, unfortunately, young people are assuming a fuller share of political, economic, and social responsibility for their future and the future of society at an earlier age. And this is vexing. Socialism has the capacity to be many times more efficient than capitalism in its use of society's intellectual potential.

The Komsomol welcomes the restoration of Leninist norms of intraparty life, the processes of democratization and self-purification going on in the party, the renunciation of the supplanting of state and economic organs, and petty tutelage over social organizations. The Komsomol resolutely supports those steps designed to develop socialist democracy and establish the socialist legal state in which the free will of the people, the power of the soviets, and the full equality of all before the law will truly be ensured. However, the Komsomol is equally resolute in rejecting every attempt to impose the idea of the multiparty system as an indispensable condition of socialist pluralism and to cast doubt on the CPSU's ability to play the part of vanguard in our society. We are convinced: Only Lenin's party, which has elaborated the only real policy for the renewal of socialist society and which put forward the idea of restructuring, has the

ability to lead it and see it through. Although we could not discuss this in the Komsomol Central Committee, I support the proposal on the representation of the leaders of the corresponding party organizations in the soviets. In my view, the soviets will be stronger and the party will be closer to the people. That is logical and right.

It is our profound conviction that the Komsomol must work under the direct leadership of the party. But it must take a significantly more active part in elaborating the party's political line. Party committees must at last refrain from interfering in the Komsomol's internal affairs and from applying administrative pressure when the aktiv is being elected, when cadres are being confirmed, and when Komsomol members are being recommended for CPSU membership. Incidentally, this is the only right that we have as yet been unable to get transferred to the basic unit of the Komsomol—the primary Komsomol organizations.

Could mistakes be made? Obviously, mistakes are possible and even inevitable when dealing with young people, but the party has sufficient political resources to correct them and influence Komsomol life. This can be done by Communists, and through persuasion, not coercion. We favor the elimination of petty party tutelage over the Komsomol, but not—understand me—as a way of distancing ourselves from the party and pursuing our own special youth policy. That's nonsense! We want this, because, for the first time since the Komsomol's effective ouster from politics in the thirties, we can perhaps get close to the party politically and assert its influence among the young.

The view that has spread recently among a section of Komsomol members and even party members—that the elimination of petty tutelage over Komsomol organizations by party organizations requires that the Komsomol draw back somewhat from the party—is, in the opinion of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee, most profoundly deluded. Such a delusion could only have grown up in the soil of a complete misunderstanding of the radical distinction between the relationship among the three communist organizations—the party, the Komsomol, and the Pioneers—and their relationship with any other social body.

It goes without saying that to try to implement such an idea would be utterly disastrous for the Komsomol and could have the most serious political consequences for the party.

Comrades, the Komsomol is the effective representative of young people to the extent that it succeeds in propounding among them the communist world view and morality, on one hand, and in expressing in society the fundamental interests of all young people on the other. Thus far, we have coped very badly with both tasks. However, the Komsomol will fight for the right to be the political vanguard of all Soviet youth. The Komsomol is opposed to the monopoly of one or several social organizations, whatever they may be, over the right to express the whole great variety of young people's interests. In any case, that is impossible.

We see it as our task to rally Komsomol members and non-Komsomol youth, young people and adults, and formal and informal structures into a sort of united front of struggle for restructuring and a renewed socialism.

We welcome and will support the broadest development of all forms of independent social activity by young people and Komsomol members, provided they serve the interests of socialism and the interests of the people and of the young.

Our main task, though, is to restore the Leninist concept of the Communist Youth Union and purge it of the excrescences of bureaucracy and formalism. This is how we think: Democracy, glasnost, and social justice must always be much greater in the Komsomol than they are in society as a whole or in any other organization, for it is a youth organization.

The Komsomol has been and remains an educational organization that accomplishes its mission through the self-education of young people. In active political, labor, and social activity, the Komsomol continues to regard the inculcation of communist morality as its main task. You may ask: What is new about that? The new element in the understanding of communist morality lies in the attitude toward social property and the environment, to historical and cultural monuments, to the elderly, invalid, and orphaned, and to the memory of those who died in the October years, during the personality cult, in the Patriotic War, or while fulfilling their international duty—in short, to everything that does not belong and cannot belong to oneself as an individual. We see that as the most reliable indicator of the growth of the communist outlook in a person. And there is no need—as has frequently been done in recent times—to counterpose the one to the other. The spiritual and moral values common to all mankind at the end of the 20th century are, in our view, most fully expressed in the original, Leninist concept of communist morality.

Comrades! The main question facing the conference, as we see it, is that of continuing restructuring, of its pace and depth. To this main question the Komsomol answers firmly and definitely: We must continue resolutely and without interruption, with even greater boldness along the entire front in the name of the people and for the sake of the present and future of our socialist motherland!

Thank you. (Applause)

Kabaidze's Address

PM0307110188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by V.P. Kabaidze, general director of the Ivanovo Machine Tool Building Production Association named for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR, at the 29 June evening session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! I feel that a terrible burden of responsibility has descended on me due to this speech, as I am the first of the 350 directors present here to get to the rostrum.

I have listened very closely to all the speeches and have tried to imagine, both before and during the conference, what we will be taking back with us. It seems to me that the main question we have to deal with is the elaboration of a strategy that people will believe in. That applies first and foremost to the economy. It is our most sensitive issue, the one on which we are most bogged down. What must be done, in my view? I am not going to theorize; I am a practical man. Something remarkable has been brought forth—self-financing, a complex and difficult process. We knew it was not something ready-made. I remember, a year ago, when the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee invited us, two dozen or so directors, to a meeting. We said frankly that not everything was ready, but the switch had to be made. So we started to work, switched to self-financing before everyone else, and now sense how far the other echelons of power are lagging behind.

There has been a great deal of discussion—should ministries be eliminated, and how many should there be? Clearly, on one hand, it is a paradox—no one in the world has as many ministers as we do, but it's a shambles. (Applause) Don't expect me to say: Let's eliminate them tomorrow. You will see in a moment what I am getting at. In my opinion, the big thing is our lack of consistency. Everyone must be switched to self-financing. Once, not that long ago, we proposed that soviets should be switched to self-financing. Roughly speaking, I would transfer 50 percent of the profit to the state budget and we would divide it in two, one-half for the region and one-half for central needs. But that is a hypothetical figure, which must be worked out. Then, in the first place, it will be perfectly clear who is putting money into the budget and how much, and then the soviets will have a real role.

There is a great deal of discussion now: Should we have full-time deputies, as in America? What will they do?! Make the rounds of Moscow offices, or what?! So we who work at the regional level will be earning bread for Soviet power, while the tumultuous debate goes on there. (Applause) It seems to me that this question must be solved here, at the conference, and not put off! And I have a practical proposal: Ivanovo is the home of the first soviet in Russia. So let's begin in 1989 with Ivanovo and other volunteers! (Applause)

Now I want to say something about ministries. (Audience stirs) To be honest, I do not need the ministry. (Applause) We can do perfectly well without it. We get our own feed now and we get currency ourselves. What can the minister provide? Absolutely nothing! But that does not mean coordinating centers are unnecessary. However, they must work and feed off us, not off the budget. So if the minister "catches the mice" we will feed him, if he doesn't, there is no need. (Laughter, applause)

Comrades! Science must be switched to self-financing. I listened closely to what Guriy Ivanovich said here. He is a man I greatly respect. I expected some bold proposals from him. There were none. What a pity, Guriy Ivanovich. (Applause) I believe we must also switch science to self-financing, for it has been living off the central budget for too long. (Applause) To illustrate my point, I want to say that, of course, there are genuine scientific institutes. Comrade Shcherbitskiy is fortunate. I think there are two marvelous scientific facilities in the Ukraine—the Paton Institute and the Glushkov Institute. They truly are examples of how to work. As for the other scientific research institutes, you could count the excellent ones on the fingers of two hands. I am involved with high technology production and I need their products. Scientific research institutes have been spreading like wildfire, in my own ministry too. The Moscow Party Gorkom secretary was not at his best when he spoke here. (Applause) He complained that there were things which we naughty Ivanovites still hadn't supplied, built for Moscow, apparently. (Laughter) An incorrect position, fundamentally incorrect. I learned a terrifying figure recently: There are hundreds of thousands of scientific personnel in the capital, so what is it, a convention of infant prodigies? (Applause) You also have room here for children's establishments, for hotels, and other things. Comrades, don't think that my intention is to chew out science; I believe we must find ways and means to improve its performance. We are lagging behind: How come? I haven't heard anything about the South Korean Scientific Research Institute, but just consider this: South Korea has jumped into the top 10 industrially developed countries. There is much more I want to say. Comrades! We must learn, look at the way others work. Just look, all production organization in our country is set at a primitive level, based on the barter system. In theory we all study, talk, give lectures, criticize, but there is no movement. How is the cooperative system to be organized, how should a machine building enterprise or anything else be organized? I'll give the others a kick later. (Laughter)

Just look at the extent to which everyone tolerates the idiotic situation where, for instance, we make 70 percent of our standard parts. If we can't cope with nuts, bolts, and screws, what will come of restructuring then, for God's sake?! (Laughter)

I have read the transcripts of every party congress. I read the one from the 17th congress very closely, and at every congress they talked about it, about standard parts, bolts, and so on. In fact, they are right when they say that clever people learn from their mistakes, but fools repeat them. We've had enough of that, for sure! (Applause)

Conrades! It is time to come to grips with the chaos in construction. For all the shortcomings in machine building, our construction sector has the worst record as far as production organization and planning are concerned. We tolerate this, too. I do not want to develop the thesis at length, but we see it as normal to spend 15 or 20 years building a plant. No one shoots himself or goes crazy. (Laughter, applause). As general director of the "Ivanovo-Pyongyang" international association, I can tell you about construction in North Korea. There a building similar to the one I have would be built in 9 months. Some 50,000 square meters in 9 months! The building at my association, one of 27 major projects in the country, has been under construction for 8 years now, and I'm afraid they will still be writing out their measures when I am carried out feet first. (Laughter, applause)

I believe the party must roundly condemn parasitism. We have all been corrupted by it. Before coming to the conference I toured all the machine building enterprises in the city of Ivanovo, and because I was the only machine builder in a delegation composed otherwise of ladies, I met with the collectives. (Applause) Terribly interesting meetings. What was typical of them? "Comrade Kabaidze, go and get an apartment block out of them, do that for us." Get, not earn—that's typical.

Our minister got the 27 congress delegates together. Well, wise directors, all the hard workers have been given letters and it is all give this and give that.... I told them honestly: "For many years, I have not asked my minister for anything and I am not going to." In the first place, it is humiliating. Everyone must earn it! But here it is often those pleading poverty who are successful. We love the lame and the poor! (Laughter, applause)

I cannot stand all the paper-shuffling. At the 27th party congress I said that if each delegate did not tear up half a dozen papers on his return home, his presence at the meeting would have been in vain. In fact, the amount of paper is increasing, damn it. And I have realized one thing: It is hopeless to fight the paper; you have to kill the authors. (Laughter, applause).

I will cite a small example, but one that says a lot. Every month, every quarter, and every year the chief accountant comes to see me. I want to give an example of a document everyone fills out—the quarterly, monthly, annual report. I am a general director, an old workhorse. I need seven or eight of the figures in that report. I ask: Where do the rest go? To the statistics administration, the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, and financial bodies. I can just imagine my own minister getting ledgers from 400 enterprises. Who will analyze them? (Applause) When a general director needs seven figures. You can see the stranglehold paper has on us. Is that restructuring, then? Yet someone is sitting there and is responsible for it. Is he restructuring himself? (Applause)

Comrades! Of course, I would not want 3 years to fly by for nothing. We have had few successes so far in the economy. But if we have climbed on to the "tiger of restructuring" we cannot get off; we can only make it go faster. (Applause)

I am a maximalist by nature. Of course, I desperately want to speed things up. Everything is seen in such a bad light; that may be necessary. It probably is. But sometimes I catch myself saying—just look around! Indeed, had I been told it 5 years ago I never would have believed that on the strength of my signature and that of the party committee secretary, people would get foreign travel documents within 24 hours. First they traveled to socialist countries, now they can go anywhere. I now have the right to buy and sell in all the countries of the world, without asking anyone, at my own risk.

Had I dreamed that I would be a general director concluding agreements with Soviet, Bulgarian, Korean, and GDR firms, I would not have thought it possible. But today I got some good news from the director of my foreign trade firm. He called me this morning, saying he had just gotten back from the FRG and had sold nine processing centers to the FRG and Switzerland and brought back 3 million greenbacks. (Applause) Of course, that's peanuts to Comrade V.M. Kamentsev, but if they were to tell me that half of it was mine—1.5 million...well, life would be sweet! These are interesting times. But I meet with many leaders, and what is this habit we have? Everyone is waiting for instructions again. It has all been said. Now it really depends on us. We must do our thing.

Latvia's Pugo on National Issues

PM0107150588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by B.K. Pugo, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, at the 29 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! A year ago someone compared the course of restructuring with the taiga: "Up above there's noise, but down below it's quiet; only the cones [shishki—literal meaning "cones"; also means "bigwigs"] are falling." These were only jokes, but there was a measure of truth in them.

Today the people are saying something else. Today, if the cones fly it is most often from the ground up. People are seeing increasingly clearly that the future of the country and of socialism depends on their ability and labor.

The inferiority complex of being just a "cog in a wheel" and the habit of a life based on orders from above with one's hand held in permanent salute are becoming things of the past. Figuratively speaking, Soviet people are suffering from an "ailment" which needs no cure. They are beginning to view the fate of restructuring as their own personal cause.

This interest in the success of restructuring became particularly clear during the preparation for our conference. Soviet Latvia's working people submitted thousands of proposals and critical comments on the acceleration of the socioeconomic development of their republic and the whole country. The majority are addressed directly to party committees. That is quite understandable. People see the party as the decisive force which began restructuring and is carrying it out and which wants to and can change their lives for the better.

But there is another point which must not be overlooked. The party is under attack from both right and left. Some think that the party is unjustifiably forcing the pace of the restructuring processes. Others accuse us of a lack of determination.

In fact, both haste and undue sluggishness are dangerous for restructuring. After all, if we think about it we come to the conclusion that many conflicts in our forward movement stem not from the nature of socialism but from the fact that the speed and sequence of our transformations are wrong.

We have no right to make mistakes today. People have too many hopes pinned on the conference and they expect it to give a precise and clear answer to these questions: How is restructuring to proceed? How is it to be made irreversible? We are pledged to formulate the right strategy.

The question of our party's place, role, and future is an especially acute one for us now. Recently there have been very many who aspire to the role of leader of restructuring.

But permit me to ask: Is there another force in our society apart from the party which could assume the full burden and responsibility for the course of restructuring? No. That is the reality which I think needs no special proof.

But it is also clear that we cannot live on our past achievements. We must now earn the masses' respect by our deeds and learn how to work in the new way. As Lenin said: "The point of the matter now is that vanguard is not afraid to work on itself, to refashion itself, and to openly recognize when it is neither sufficiently prepared nor sufficiently capable."

The report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, directs us to that. This work cannot be postponed; we have no right to allow the demagogues and pseudo-revolutionaries to seize the initiative from us and to divert people from the main line of restructuring.

Comrades! We bear a special responsibility for ensuring the well-considered and balanced development of Lenin's nationalities policy. We can see that during restructuring not only individual people but also whole nations, including the Latvian people, have begun to show greater social and political activeness. We sense people's healthy dissatisfaction with what has been achieved. This growth of national self-awareness, this desire to put our own house in order more quickly and increase the republic's contribution to restructuring finds support in the CPSU Central Committee. That is quite understandable: The stronger the parts of our union are, the mightier the union itself. It has always been and will remain based on the friendship and fraternity of the Soviet peoples, which we must cherish as the apple of our eye, as the report said.

This must be constantly borne in mind, because the processes of the growth of national self-awareness are complex. Some people, misunderstandig the principles of social justice, are demanding a larger slice of the nation's cake for themselves even though it is far more appropriate for all of us together to do more work and to increase the size of that cake. In our republic, too, unfortunately, there are people who exploit national feelings, inflame passions, and revive old wounds and thus create new ones. We are not going in the same direction as those people. They are heading into an impasse, whereas we want a sensible solution to the problems which really accumulated in the republic during the years of stagnation. I have in mind here the disproportions in the development of a number of national economic sectors and the social infrastructure's lag behind the development of industrial production. But the republic's inhabitants are particularly worried by the inordinately large influx of manpower from other regions and the serious deterioration in the environmental situation.

We blame ourselves for a number of shortcomings, but quite a few problems have been created by the excessive diktat of union ministries, which were in the habit of passing off departmental interests as those of the whole state and getting away with it. In the pursuit of instant gain they concentrate their enterprises in those places where the infrastructure is already developed—with the result, as a rule, that they merely worsen it and cause discontent among people whatever their nationality. Departmental expansion of this kind increases the problems of any region. But under the conditions of the national republic it also complicates relations between nations. They have become noticeably more acute of late in our republic, too. Some try to blame this on restructuring and democratization. We cannot accept that. It is

far more accurate to say that those problems have surfaced because a real opportunity has appeared for an open discussion and fundamental solution to them.

This is confirmed by the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the conference, which convincingly stress the imperative need to take urgent measures to further develop the Soviet federation of sovereign socialist republics. Essentially we must create a new and more efficient mechanism for mutual relations between union organs, ministries, and departments and local organs of Soviet power at republic level. It is necessary to ensure the genuine sovereignty of each fraternal republic. Here we have in mind a substantial increase in the independence of union republics and the expansion of local soviet organs' rights in developing the economy, the social sphere, and culture. I stress that it is a question not of isolation but of the exercise of rights enshrined in the USSR Constitution and the decentralization of administration. In a number of cases, of course, new legislative acts will also be needed.

A number of constructive proposals have already been heard here which are consonant with the opinion of Soviet Latvia's working people, and we support them. It is quite possible that in the long term it will be necessary to make some amendments to the USSR Constitution. For example, Article 73 needs to define interrelations between union departments and enterprises and local organs of soviet power more clearly and to give the soviets priority in the solution of many problems. This is particularly relevant today. Speeches by conference participants and proposals from many working people to the republic's leadership convince us of that. People even say: If you do not obtain satisfaction from the departments, we will do so from you. And they are right to speak that way.

These questions have recently become the subject of the most thorough analysis by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's government. We prepared and submitted to the CPSU Central Committee and Council of Ministers 84 proposals on expanding the republic's rights in the spheres of planning, finance, price formation, the development of the economy, and culture. Sometimes it is sufficient simply to revoke outmoded instructions to obtain a positive solution. You know, recently the union Gosagroprom had the audacity, albeit as an experiment, to scrap the procedure under which Riga's confectioners had to go to Moscow to obtain approval for recipes for new cakes. It wasn't the end of the world. The Gosagroprom's authority did not suffer and the quality of the cakes was none the worse for it.

Clearly in other cases, too, Comrade Ministers, questions which could easily be settled locally should not be turned into union-level problems. We very much need the support of the CPSU Central Committee and the country's government in the struggle against the pressure from union departments which, by fair means or foul, are trying to build or expand their production units in Latvia. Their requests for this and the next 5-year plan already exceed our construction workers' potential by R500 million.

Quite possibly it will be necessary here even to revise a number of earlier government resolutions; it may indeed be unavoidable. We cannot go on attracting manpower from neighboring oblasts of the non-Chernozem zone, which are underpopulated as it is. It is time to make leaders of union ministries and departments more strictly accountable from a party standpoint for their devotion to the extensive development of sectors. They should be headed not simply by competent specialists but first and foremost by far-sighted politicians. From their ministerial desks they must be able to see not only enterprises but also the people living around them and take account of their interests, too.

Economics and party policy make it incumbent now not to dictate one's will to regions but to give them an economic interest in the development of a given sector. The USSR Gosplan must not only restrict unreasonable departmental appetites but also think about redesignating those enterprises for which the republic has neither the raw materials nor the manpower to ensure normal working.

Is it really economical, for example, to go on developing weaving and spinning production units in Latvia if we have to import the raw materials from Central Asia? Would it not be better to create production units in those places where they have sufficient manpower and raw materials close by? You shouldn't take people to where the work is but vice versa.

Economic accountability also needs a better-considered policy when it comes to the location of production forces. The burden of irrational transport costs is already very heavy for enterprises. Economists are beginning to think about this increasingly often in their discussion on the creation of the concept of regional economic accountability. There is much that is attractive about it because it will make it possible to implement the socialist principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor" at regional level, too.

Quite understandably, this form of economic accountability should not only make each region richer but also strengthen the country's historically formed, integrated national economic complex, because the economy of all the republics depends on the state of that complex. Without question there must be no place for regional egoism in this concept.

Social justice demands the more effective stimulation of a given region's interest in increasing the production of consumer goods and in producing above-plan output in general.

The idea of self-sufficiency succeeds only when above-plan output is left at the disposal of the producers. Because soviets can and must be regarded as one of the most important guarantors of increasing regional independence, the republic's working people mandated our delegation to raise the question of accelerating the fundamental reform of soviets at all levels and of preparing a new USSR Law on Soviets of People's Deputies.

But it is a strange situation. The law clearly defines the rights of the labor collective council under today's conditions, but the work of soviets is regulated by obsolete edicts. I support the earlier proposal that we must not only give full power to the soviets but also provide that power with an economic and legal basis. They should not be dependent on the favor of enterprises but vice versa. The first step toward increasing the soviets' independence could be to introduce at least a partial economic accountability into their work and raise wages to the level of the economic sphere.

At a meeting with the republic's public, which discussed the platforms and instructions for our delegation, many other proposals on improving national policy were also viewed. We believe that they must be reflected in the conference resolution on improving national relations. We need an integrated concept for the development of interethnic relations and a modern scientific interpretation of many complex questions and ideas. There must be new approaches to language policy, the formation of union republics' budgets, and the setting of purchase prices in various regions.

I want to support the idea expressed in the report on the fundamental reform of the Soviet of Nationalities. In our view, the working people's proposal on the creation of a permanent workers organ similar to the former People's Commissariat for Nationalities Affairs deserves detailed study. The problems which we have encountered in interethnic relations need extraordinary solutions. They cannot be postponed. Delay may complicate the situation in the country and slow down restructuring. That is why our delegation unanimously supports the CPSU Central Committee's proposal on the holding of a Central Committee plenum on national problems, and proposes that this be done as soon as possible.

The CPSU Program says: "The party and our state have an interest in inculcating in every Soviet person a sense of the friendship and fraternity that unite all the nations and ethnic groups of the USSR, a high standard of contact between nations, intolerance toward manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, national narrow-mindedness, and national egoism..." These words should not simply be a declaration but an action program for each of us.

Our grandfathers in the years of the revolution laid a secure foundation for the friendship of the Soviet peoples. Our fathers sealed it with their blood on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War. And our duty, the duty of all Communists, is to strengthen that friendship and do everything to ensure that the national factor does not slow restructuring down but speeds it up. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

Uzbekistan's Nishanov Holds News Conference

PM0107200588 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 p 4

["Special Correspondents R. Guseynov and A. Drozdov Report From the International Press Center at the 19th All-Union Party Conference": "Reason Versus Emotions"]

[Excerpt] Despite the large volume of information which the newspapers and television are putting out these days, there is still a certain sense of "news hunger" being felt. Probably this is connected with the fact that the questions raised at the conference are unprecedented in their topicality and are required to play a decisive role in the fate of restructuring.

The delegation from Uzbekistan is one of the largest at the conference. At a meeting with journalists, R. Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee, reported that each of the delegates has had many meetings with, and has received mandates from, working people. The main one is to support in every way possible the CPSU Central Committee's political course toward restructuring. Responding to a question from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA on what brought about the necessity for the recent trip to Tajikistan by the representative delegation from Uzbekistan and what problems were examined during this meeting, R. Nishanov said:

There is nothing surprising in the fact of our trip and meeting. The Tajiks and Uzbeks are two branches of the same tree, and the friendship and kinship of the two mutually close peoples goes back into the mists of time. Traditions and rituals augment the close family bonds binding both the individual representatives and the peoples as a whole. After the national-state delimitation, which took place after the October Revolution, some of the Tajiks domiciled in Uzbekistan were recorded as Uzbeks in their passports as a result of the fault of some functionaries. Certain Tajik schools were closed. It can be said that the rights of the Tajik population were infringed to a certain degree. Arguments arose among scholars as to what nationality the great Avitsenna belonged, although what argument can there be about the nationality of a person whose mother and father were both Tajiks? Voices began ringing out, talking about territorial problems.

Our delegation's trip to Tajikistan and the meetings held with leaders of the fraternal republic and with the people helped to put everything in its place. We have no grudges against each other, nor are there any problems between us.

I would not agree with the claim, R. Nishanov continued, that the entire republic is corrupt from bottom to top. Today the population of Uzbekistan numbers 20 million people and the vast majority of them are honest, working people. Our annual output totals R26 billion. At the same time, a certain group of people invested with power did wallow in corruption, for which they were punished.

My predecessor in the post of first secretary—Usmankhodzhayev—is on a personal pension and lives in Moscow, R. Nishanov noted. Despite certain claims he has neither been brought to trial nor been the subject of investigation, and no charges have been brought against him.

One of the questions keenly discussed at the conference, and consequently at the press center, pertained to changes in the society's spiritual life, progress in culture, art, and the spread of glasnost in the mass media. The general trends and the main thrust are probably most important. But some of our colleagues are stuck on a different wavelength: What names were specifically mentioned, what publication was criticized, and what was the reaction in the hall. We would like to clarify the position with regard to the criticism of literary journals. On the second day of the conference, one of the delegates criticized the work of OGONEK, and other journals—MOSKVA, NASH SOVREMENNIK, and MOLODAYA GVARDIYA—were enumerated but were not criticized.

A meeting with V. Lakshin, the well-known critic and first deputy chief editor of the journal ZNAMYA, aroused great interest.

The energetic and businesslike VOA correspondent Dzhoan Bicher [name as published], who did not leave a single news conference without having asked a question, inquired: Did V. Lakshin regard those who criticized the press at the party conference as enemies of restructuring?

I am convinced, V. Lakshin replied, that it is essential to maintain self-restraint in the heat of polemics so as to avoid getting into a state of spiritual civil war. The times when lamentable things used to happen to people who were named as "enemies of the people" are still remembered, so I would not like to introduce such an expression as "enemy of restructuring." [passage omitted]

Further on Third Day Speeches, Activities

Speeches Summarized

LD3006120888 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—The 19th National Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) is in its third day in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow, discussing a blueprint for furthering the perestroyka drive for reform in both the political system and the economy.

More than 20 delegates have already taken the floor in the debate that has begun on Mikhail Gorbachev's report delivered on the opening day of the forum Tuesday.

All the speakers, from local party leaders to workers and farmers to intellectuals, called for consistent and radical economic reform and for promoting democracy and glasnost, or openness.

All of them agreed that the nation's future is in socialism.

The debate today began with sharp criticisms of some ministries and agencies as Viktor Postnikov, director-general of a broiler plant in the southern Russian region of Stavropol, and rolling mill operator Veniamin Yarin from the Urals took on bureaucracy for consciously holding back the economic reform.

Moscow University rector Anatoliy Logunov, a vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, also noted that perestroyka has been proceeding more slowly than it should have.

He said the omnipotence of the ministries should be bridled by the party Central Committee. The (?party) and its Central Committee should closely follow the progress of the economic reform as the party is the only political force which can make it take hold, Lugonov said.

Vasiliy Starodubtsev, chairman of the agribusiness amalgamation Novomoskovskoye in the Tula region, said those who have for many years hindered Soviet society in life and work should get their just deserts. He called for punishing them morally and financially.

The years of stagnation have inflicted heavy material and moral losses on the country as people have ceased to believe in anything and ceased to work, Starodubtsev said.

"We have to find such solutions as they will begin to trust us and will go about tackling economic tasks in real earnest so as to reach the front edge of progress," he stressed.

The conference delegate voiced the opinion that there is a "caste of untouchables" among senior party officials, that is leaders beyond the reach of criticism. "We should duly assess this phenomenon," he said.

Starodubtsev spoke with pain about pressing problems in agriculture and difficulties with fulfilling the national Food Program.

He recalled that for decades many economic problems in the country have been addressed at the expense of farming. "Time has come to repay the debt to the farmers," he said.

He added it is especially urgent to set stable prices on farm produce and solve the housing problem in the countryside.

Vladimir Melnikov, leader of the party organization of the Komi Autonomous Republic who yesterday reproached the conference presidium for an inadequate representation of some of the country's regions among the speakers, was given an opportunity to address the conference today.

He agreed with Gorbachev who said in his report it is imperative to fight ethnic egoism and localism. Melnikov added, however, that the idea needs to be clarified.

"What is meant by ethnic egoism? If we in the Komi Republic are opposed to an unreasonable approach to using natural resources and are for a careful attitude to vulnerable northern nature, it is not egoism, but a civic stand," he said.

The staff of the party Central Committee should at this time of (?revolutionary) change set an example of mastering Lenin's style of leadership like never before, but perestroyka has been too slow in its work, Melnikov said.

He pointed to ill-considered decisions and too much haste in a whole number of issues, noting that this leads not only to low practical results, but also to new snags and problems.

"As the Central Committee Theses for the conference were discussed, many Communists and non-party people gave us an even more strongly worded mandate: Those who in the past actively promoted the policy of stagnation may not serve and work on the central party and government bodies now, at the time of perestroyka. They should answer for everything and do so personally," Melnikov said.

Asked by Gorbachev whom he had in mind, the delegate replied: "I would apply this to Comrade Solomentsev in the first place and to Comrades Gromyko, Afansyev, Arbatov..."

As the process of democratization has been forging strongly ahead, quite a few people (?have been) deliberately bending public opinion to believe that the party is nothing but bureaucrats and functionaries and nothing but perks, Melnikov continued.

"Of course, it is not ruled out that there perhaps are bribe-takers and red-tape bureaucrats among the party staff even today, but they don't make more than a fraction of one percent.

"The vast majority of the party workers have only one privilege, that is to work for 12 to 14 hours a day, without sparing their health, and, as a rule, without any days off.

"But whereas previously they could draw moral satisfaction from their work, now, in the period of perestroyka, even that could be battered to pieces as well," Melnikov said.

"The party's prestige cannot go without the prestige of a party worker. And to strengthen this prestige is a duty for everyone, including the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee," the delegate said.

One message sent to the conference Presidium and read out by the session chairman was in connection with remarks by Vladimir Melnikov, leader of the party organization of the Komi Autonomous Republic.

Written by delegate Mamayev, it said:

"Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko is a man respected among the people and in the party. He has devoted his life and activities to us. As to us, however, we—the people, the Communists—have put only another burden on him. The principle 'whoever labors is loaded with the work' has worked this time as well. We have worked him too hard. And Comrade Gromyko today has fallen behind life, but he has done his job and his noble deeds are remembered by the people. So it wasn't appropriate to charge at the man all of a sudden. He has popular respect and love."

Delegates reacted to the message with applause.

Speaking at the conference earlier today, Melnikov said, among other things:

"As the Central Committee Theses for the conference were discussed, many Communists and non-party people gave us an even more strongly worded mandate: Those who in the times past actively promoted the policy of stagnation may not be [in] and work on central party and government bodies now, at the time of perestroyka. They should answer for everything and do so personally."

Asked by Gorbachev whom he had in mind, the delegate replied: "I would apply this to Comrade Solomentsev in the first place and to Comrades Gromyko, Afanasyev, Arbatov..."

"It will not be an exaggeration to say that every person sitting in this hall holds the destiny of perestroyka in his hands, and this means the destiny of the party and the country", said the editor-in-chief of the newspaper IZVESTIYA Ivan Laptev. "In effect, we are discussing two truly crucial issues—what the party would be like and what the system of Soviet Government should be like at the present stage of our development".

"If we look today at the work of a party secretary", he went on, "we will see that this political leader every hour and every day appears simultaneously in many (?capital) cities. This is a reflection of the fact that the party in many respects is substituting for state, government and other organisations, has assumed their functions. And by doing so it has simultaneously accepted all the criticisms of these bodies by the working people. But today we have at long last said that the party can no longer perform this universal, unlimited role. That is why the apparatus that has been set up for administration can now be handed over by the party to government, state and economic bodies".

Speaking of what the soviets of people's deputies should be like, Ivan Laptev expressed the view that the merging of the functions of leader of a party organisation and head of a Soviet would at long last create personal responsibility for the situation in each region, would give the region a person of authority who would be accountable to the population and to the public and would have no chance to hide behind the back of the party committee. "It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this proposal for the cause of democratisation. This is an outstanding proposal", he said.

Svyatoslav Fedorov, director general of the inter-branch research and technical complex of eye micro surgery of the Russian Federation's Ministry of Public Health, devoted his speech mostly to the principle of distribution in accordance with labour input.

He said that today, just as in the early 1920s, it is necessary to raise the question of moving from the surplus-appropriation system to tax in kind, that is from the administrative-command to economic methods. "Where self-administration, self-financing and cost-accounting are already in operation, we have a growth both of labour productivity and earnings", he said. "But the presently existing system of skill rates contradicts the principle of distribution according to labour input".

As an example he cited his research and technical complex where with the introduction of cost-accounting the annual number of operations rose from 24,000 to 100,000, while now the possibility of 300,000 and even 500,000 operations a year is being discussed. In the process people have begun to earn more, this being advantageous to the collective and to the state.

Touching on the planned reform of the political system Svyatoslav Fedorov said that the tenture of elective office should be limited to five, maximum ten years. "The road should be opened to the young who are brimming with energy, fresh thoughts and eagerness to work", he said.

Mikhail Gorbachev, opening the afternoon session, announced that Komsomol (Young Communist League) leaders who are delegates to the conference proposed adopting a youth resolution.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said in this connection that, in the opinion of the commission drafting the main political resolution of the conference, it was expedient to include it in a detailed clause relating to youth problems.

The delegates backed this opinion.

Gorbachev said that 261 people put their names down for taking the floor. Commission members discussed whether the conference should meet in sections to let as many people as possible speak out. But in this case, many would not know what others said.

The conference delegates unanimously backed the proposal not to hold sittings in sections.

Genrykh Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee, addressing the afternoon session observed that many people now, in talking about patriotism, implied one-nation patriotism.

He pointed to the danger of disuniting nations, recalling that it was only thanks to unity and friendship of all ethnic groups that the USSR won the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945).

[Words indistinct] the developments in Armenia and Azerbaijan," Borovik said. "What fatal role can be played by intellectuals, historians and writers if they think that exalting one people at the expense of another or at the expense the entire country is their supreme task."

In the opinion of Borovik, it was necessary to find a mechanism that would shut all channels for the transmission of disinformation and incomplete information.

"The more truth, the greater faith," the speaker emphasised.

Valeriy Platonov, secretary of the party committee of Chelyabinsk's Lenin tractor works, called for elaborating the status of secretary of the CPSU primary organisation.

Secretary, being the leader of the party's principal link, he pointed out, should have all necessary conditions for pursuing a principled policy.

This status should be entered in the party rules, he said.

Platonov observed that primary and other local party organisations should be allowed to use part of membership fee money and other incomes to finance their own activity and pay permanent staff.

Olga Zakharova, an operator at the Yakutalmaz production and science amalgamation, brought home to the delegates the proposals of her work mates concerning the style of party work and solution of burning issues of work and life in the north.

She criticised unjustified secrecy in the party. Proceedings of party plenary meetings and other information of great public interest had not been published. Rectifying the situation was an important element of democratising party life, she pointed out.

Zakharova came out in favour of limiting the term in office for top party leaders by two five-year periods. She stressed the importance of free, extensive exchanges of views on major issues of party life and decision-making process with due account for different views.

"The most important thing yet to be achieved at all levels of management is to restructure the psychology of personnel, the attitude to work and life, to civic duties, which is most closely connected with the reform of the entire political system," said Anatoliy Fateyev, member of the Central Auditing Commission of the CPSU and second secretary of the Leningrad party regional committee.

He said that the conference documents should more clearly reflect the role of the party in personnel assignment by granting party organisations and their elected bodies the priority in promoting alternative candidates from among party members and non-party people.

The delegate stressed the need for (?more) detailed reflection of the real rights of the soviets (local governing councils) in the corresponding section of the USSR Constitution and for the adoption of a special law on soviets of people's deputies. In his view, the preparation (?for) holding of the party conference graphically reflected the fundamentally new ideological and political situation in Soviet society and convincingly confirmed the Communists' spirited interest in revolutionary change.

Twenty delegates spoke today. The conference will continue tomorrow.

Ryzhkov Opens Morning Session

LD3006103088 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0700 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference resumed work in Moscow an hour ago. This is the Kremlin Palace of Congress. Taking their seats in the Presidium are Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, party, and state leaders.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov opened the morning session. He asked Viktor Ivanovich Postnikov, general director of Stavropol Kray Broiler Association, to take the floor. Acting on the presidium's instruction, he read out a note from Tamara Vasilyevna Gracheva, a delegate of the Moscow city organization, which speaks of the difficulties in implementing the food program. [video shows long shots of audience and presidium; leaders filing in: Gorbachev, Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Ligachev, Zaykov, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Demichev, and Vorotnikov can be discerned; close up of seated presidium reveals Dobrynin, Biryukova, and Talyzin; delegates stand up and applaud when leaders enter; Gorbachev stands and applauds back]

Postnikov Decries 'Mafia'

LD3006191888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Excerpt] Ninety minutes ago the 3d day of the work of the 19th All-Union Party Conference started in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Debates continue on the CPSU Central Committee report "On Progress in Implementing the Resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks To Deepen Restructuring." Comrade Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who chairs this session, gave the floor to Comrade Postnikov, general director of the Stavropolye Broiler-Breeding Association.

[Begin Postnikov recording] As long as the worker is alienated from the land, as long as he is not a co-owner of the enterprise or takes little part in management, he will be working in a formal way. This means that the Cooperatives Law and the method of lease-contracting should take us out of this impasse. I think that this is the most central social issue to which attention should be paid today at the conference. Therefore, I propose that the Cooperatives Law be extended to all agricultural enterprises, to all associations. That is, absolutely uniform conditions for competitive labor should be created.

Concerning the management of agriculture, I think the report speaks properly about this, saying that lease contracting and cooperation exclusively presume self-administration. The enterprise should exist on its own and be self-administered by the people. Unfortunately, one has to say that we have run up against structures in the organization of sales and direct-sales trade that can cause ruin in a day. Even when it has stocks of meat, such an organization can keep any town hungry, and nobody will ever find out why. Then they take discounts for themselves, and such discounts—for example, on meat—which are equal to the profits we obtain in production. I speak about the Trade Ministry. Since 1983 I have pulled through everything when financial autonomy was being organized, but now I find myself powerless to do anything with those people. They say we do not have the mafia. I assert that we have it, this mafia. [applause] Maybe it is not of the Sicilian variety because they shoot each other there, but here they plunder the state stealthily and daily, and it is very difficult to do anything about it.

Now, for example, we have reached an agreement to deliver our production to Moscow. But we cannot find a language even for such a trifle as drawing up documents. We cannot work out the form of document for delivering meat to Moscow, although this document has been signed by two Politburo members. Nobody does anything.

Comrade Kazakov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, has dug his heels in. He sticks to all his views, without displaying any restructuring mood. They have all become ossified, they have their own trade inspection, [applause] and sometimes one feels simply bitter. There are such organizations as Meat and Dairy Trade [Myasomoltorg]. This organization does nothing but sign checks but, at the same time, it rakes in the shekels and takes all those discounts for itself. Why do they exist at all, all those idle organizations, in the period of restructuring, in our time? [applause]

In his speech, Comrade Ulyanov was looking for acting bureaucrats. I have given some examples. [laughter, applause]

Now about bureaucratism as such. I associate myself with those who speak about this phenomena with bitterness and concern. This is the main foe of restructuring now—bureaucracy beginning not from upper echelons or the managerial apparatus. It begins right at the level of local enterprise and spreads upwards to the very top. There are specific people, as Comrade Ulyanov said, and all this is well known.

For example, how could it have happened that the law has been published, the state order has been compromised, but nobody has been called to account? But there are people who are responsible, who have deliberately behaved in a manner that this law should become invalid on the very first day. And we speak about restructuring! [end recording] [passage omitted]

Metalworker Yarin Address

LD3006115288 Moscow TASS in English 0940 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—Rolling mill operator Veniamin Yarin from the V.I. Lenin Nizhniy Tagil metal-making works in the Sverdlovsk region in the Urals spoke boldly and candidly—in a worker's tradition—at the 19th national party conference here today.

He said that the shopfloor pins big hopes on this forum and accepts no other way than the one charted by the 27th party congress.

However, too many decisions, lack of firmness in enforcing them, a desire to get everything done with one fell swoop, and haste that sometimes leads to mistakes, like it has happened in the anti-drink drive, create an abnormal situation, Yarin added.

One of the conference's principal tasks, in his opinion, is to work out tactics for further action. It is essential to set priorities and deadlines and decide on those who will be responsible for meeting them.

"We should demand from the party Central Committee that it realize everything planned in a firm and strict manner", he said.

He suggested that the heads of ministries and agencies report back to worker collectives and that members of the Central Committee and its Politburo report back to party organizations as well.

"People want to know the specific matters each Politburo member is personally responsible for. This should be made common knowledge so that everyone could see who is fairing how," the conference delegate explained.

Touching on the party's ideological work, he said the Central Committee Theses for the conference say nothing of the main thing, namely the decisive role of labor.

"More is written about mistakes that are exposed than about the fact that nobody will give us [words indistinct] for free," Yarin stressed. "Our own work is the only guarantee of well-being."

"The substance of perestroyka is not only in the slogan 'More socialism', but also in that we may no longer work the way we have been working," he continued.

While agreeing with many previous speakers that bureaucracy is in the way of renewal, Yarin emphasized at the same time that the main opponent of perestroyka is inside everyone because everyone has come from the past with many of its shortcomings.

The Nizhniy Tagil worker spoke much about ecology. He urged daring and energetic action to deal with problems that have piled up in the field over the decades.

Specifically, he suggested identifying a group of cities where the ecological situation is the worst and setting the task of mending it within the next two years.

Yarin on Pollution Problems

PM0307132388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 6

[Speech by V.A. Yarin, rolling mill operator at the Nizhniy Tagil V.I. Lenin Metallurgical Combine, at the 30 June morning session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrades! I am a metal worker, a rolling mill operator, at the Nizhniy Tagil Metallurgical Combine. I have 30 years of work in the metallurgical industry and 19 years in the ranks of the party behind me. I must say that I cannot remember ever having experienced such unprecedented interest, or such heated sessions and

meetings as those which have taken place at the plant and in the city to discuss the Theses on the eve of the party conference. Some 816 suggestions were submitted at our combine alone. The discussions have shown that restructuring is really under way. It has attracted the people's interest and has stirred them to action. The proposals being submitted come from pure hearts, everyone is interested, people are coming forward with their ideas, but also—and I must stress this because it is most important—with their pains and with great hopes. The pain comes from looking and seeing that although the Law on the State Enterprise has been proclaimed, the situation at our plant, for instance, has not only failed to improve, it has actually worsened. Our profits are being taken from us just as they were in the past. All in all, there is less money left for the combine this year than last year, although, quite plainly, our performance in 1987 was better than 1986. As for housing, the reduction in money available for that amounts to one-third. The state order for both this year and next exceeds the plant's capacity. And where is the promised independence in disposing of at least part of the output?

All you see in the press are calls and appeals to abide by the law. It is time for the Central Committee to exercise its power.

The other side of the pain relates to mundane problems. The workers are asking bluntly: "Where is restructuring? The situation concerning food supplies in the stores is as poor as it was before. Furthermore, sugar rationing has been introduced. There was no meat before and there is none now. And as for consumer goods, they seem to have disappeared altogether." One elderly worker said, obviously not without reason, during the discussion of the Theses: "Let's do what we did in the postwar years and introduce tokens for goods in short supply as incentives for the best workers. I have been trying unsuccessfully for the past 6 months to buy a television set. Yet 18 months ago there were so many sets that you did not know where to look first."

Don't misunderstand me, I am not saying all this to whip up tension, but to bring home to the delegates the pain that is troubling workers and all people.

I started by talking about the pain. However, pain and hope go hand in hand. Essentially, people at every meeting spoke of their great expectations from the conference, expectations of something special.

"What do you expect from the conference?" We asked that of ourselves, we asked others, and we are asking it now. A precise and specific answer to this question is particularly important, for it allows us to present the decisions adopted by our conference as a clear platform. On the other hand, it protects people against entertaining all sorts of unachievable illusions which, if they do not materialize would lead to their loss of faith in the cause that has been launched.

So what do we expect from the conference? That it will confirm the need for restructuring? After all, life itself confirms that the chosen path is the right one. There is no other course for us apart from the course of the 27th party congress. Meanwhile, too many decisions, a lack of firmness in their implementation, a desire to solve everything at once, and excessive haste, which sometimes leads to obvious mistakes (as in the case of the wines and spirits question, for instance), create a situation where not only ordinary people's heads, but those of many leaders, too, are spinning.

We believe that one of the conference's main tasks is the elaboration of precise tactics for action (incidentally, there is no mention of tactics in the Theses). It is necessary today to clearly specify priority avenues, set targets and deadlines, allocate responsibility, and demand from the Central Committee that it ensure—firmly and rigorously—the implementation of the outlined plans. It might be expedient to devote a special party Central Committee plenum to these questions.

I propose that accounts by heads of ministries and departments directly in labor collectives be introduced, either on a regular basis or at the request of enterprise collectives. Along the same lines, accounts of party Central Committee members and even Politburo members should be organized in party organizations.

Incidentally, people were telling us frankly at meetings: "We do not know what individual members of the Politburo are responsible for, which specific questions they are in charge of. This must be made common knowledge so that everyone knows what they are doing and how. Who, specifically, should be thanked for achievements and who should be blamed for failures?" (Applause)

In my opinion, the party's ideological work in the current stage is another question that receives too little attention in the Theses. I would like to dwell briefly on three points.

First, the main thought, the thought relating to the decisive role played by labor, has somehow been pushed into the background in the Theses. Incidentally, the press is not giving it enough prominence now, either. We are writing more about the exposure of mistakes than about the fact that no one will give us anything, that the only guarantee of our prosperity is our own labor. (Applause) We must ensure that the entire ideological apparatus of the party, the press, and every person grasps the idea that the main essence of restructuring lies not just in the slogan "more socialism," but also in recognition of the fact that we cannot go on working as we have in the past! (Applause) We must, figuratively speaking, double and triple our efforts.

We feel that this thought must permeate all the materials of the conference. As we are talking about revolution today, it is quite important to correctly spot and point

out the enemy. In 1917 the enemy was obvious—he was right there, on the other side of the barricade. But where is he today? Are the bureaucrats the enemy? Well, indeed. Are leaders who are marking time the enemy? Correct. And it is true that they come in for a great deal of criticism in the press. However, there are statistics which show that 80 percent of the people polled in our city believe that they themselves are working well or very well. They think they are working creatively and, on the whole, have no complaints about life. The logic is simple—if I am working well, if the bosses are the ones to blame, then the calls for restructuring apply not to me, but to someone or something else, which has nothing to do with me. Thus, there is no reason, as it were, for me to restructure myself.

Comrades! All of us, without exception, have come to restructuring from the past with its minuses and habits, with its indifference, and its attitudes of dependence. As such, the main enemy of restructuring lives within each of us. It seems to me that here lies yet another key area on which party ideological work should focus, an area that should be attacked with the whole might of the ideological arsenal. Yet, regrettably, there are only isolated articles on this topic in the press. Not to mention the fact that so far in our country virtually no effective forms and methods of struggle against this internal and most dangerous enemy of restructuring have been devised. (Applause)

And lastly, a question that has evoked a tremendous response in our society, and which is particularly painful for us in Tagil. I am talking about ecological problems. They should be the subject of detailed discussion at the conference. I would like to touch on a number of this problem's chief aspects.

First, we did not arrive at this ecological situation overnight. We have been getting ourselves into it for decades. Now, as a result of the processes of democratization and glasnost, our eyes have been opened and, figuratively speaking, we have raised our eyes to the skies and exclaimed in horror: Good grief, what sort of life have we been and are we still leading? However, this new awareness of the situation has everywhere—not just judging by our city—become a whipping up of tension. And, comrades, what's more, these actions are taking on a mass character. For instance, after the ecological demostrations in Tagil there were articles in the newspapers URALSKIY RABOCHIY, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA referred to them twice, and they were covered on television through the "Searchlight of Restructuring" series.

Naturally, while we are grateful that our city has been given so much attention, two factors demand serious consideration. First, looking at all this information as a whole, at all the reports and unlikely stories, at all the correct and incorrect figures published in the articles, your head starts spinning and you wonder where it all came from. The general impression is that we are all but about to suffocate. This cannot but have an impact on people. Please try to understand me correctly. The ecological situation is far from normal, but it is wrong to induce a mood approaching panic. That is one point.

The second point is the absence of a constructive approach. Scanning articles on ecological questions in the press, we involuntarily wind up with the conclusion that everything comes down to closing this or that production plant, closing everything down. Of course, there are facts which are clearly intolerable. In these instances we must act boldly and resolutely. However, the main course of action must be vigorous, businesslike work. We are doing a great deal about this in our city. Questions have piled up, and they will be dicussed at a session of the city soviet immediately after the conference.

However, to ensure that this discussion truly produces an energetic, effective program, I would like to make use of this rostrum to invite the following ministers to take part in the preparation and holding of our session: Serafim Vasilevich Kolpakov, USSR minister of ferrous metallurgy (although he paid us a visit literally a few days ago); Yuriy Aleksandrovich Bespalov, USSR minister of the chemical industry; and Sergey Fedorovich Voyenushkin, USSR minister of the construction materials industry. And we ask the Central Committee to support our proposal.

In general, where a number of cities are concerned, the government must take serious, vigorous, and very constructive action on an urgent basis. Comrades, 2 or 3 months ago we learned, albeit by chance—and I would like to stress, unfortunately only by chance—that a USSR Council of Ministers resolution on measures to improve sanitary conditions in a number of the country's cities was being prepared. However, when we looked at what it had to say about Nizhniy Tagil, for instance, we were horrified by the scantiness of the proposed measures.

Comrades, I will allow myself one digression, for I cannot but fulfill the request of an old Bolshevik. He said to me: Veniamin! When you get there, you must get up and mount that high rostrum of the people and remind the delegates of a line from a song in the popular film, "Spring on Zarechnaya Street": "As a youth I used to chase pigeons along the rooftops of Zarechnaya Street." Comrades, it has been a long time since pigeons flew over our combine, and now even the crows won't come near.

Some people say there are about 150 cities in our country with a problematic ecological situation; others put the figure lower. It has been recognized that 63 cities in the USSR face a particularly complex ecological situation. I do not know whether the state can cope with them all at once, but I would like to propose the selection of a number of top priority cities where the situation is most

critical. The government can decide whether there will be 10, 30, or 60 cities in the group. These cities would then be placed at the level of a state task, and I am not afraid to say this, comrades, on par with the struggle against the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster, allocating the funds, resources, materials, and equipment necessary to radically improve the situation there within 2 years at the most. During this period, these cities should have additional funds earmarked for food, goods, medicine, and social services. In short, there should be a serious and concentrated program at government level. This will not only give people hope but also confidence and a desire to radically solve these problems permanently. Please, understand me correctly. This does not mean that we want to rely on others to solve our problems. The situation has been allowed to deteriorate too much. In short, those cities where the ecology has been most neglected cannot resolve their problems swiftly and radically by themselves. We must deal with one group of cities first, and then with another, and so on.

Comrades, as I speak, I see before my eyes the eyes of my comrades at the blast and open-hearth furnaces and rolling mills. I want to assure the party Central Committee: We believe in the irreversibility of restructuring, for we are convinced that if the working class and peasantry take restructuring into their own hands, we will be able to implement the goals that have been set more quickly. (Applause)

Academician Logunov's Speech

LD3006224588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Logunov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences and rector of Moscow University, spoke [at the 19th CPSU Conference] about the fact that economic restructuring is proceeding more slowly than it should. He feels that Soviet economic science has not yet been enriched by research into social theory. The ministries and departments are unwilling or unable to carry out reform. The delegate said that unless the situation improves decisively, a critical point could be reached. The party and its leading bodies must keep these issues at the center of their attention.

[Begin Logunov recording] The losses in science are very great, and one is simply amazed that in several areas, particularly theoretical ones, we are still up to snuff. Science in our country has been, in essence, a spoken phrase—we talk about it a great deal, we say we have done everything for science, but we have done little for its development. A considerable amount of monopolism and cliquishness has emerged. The standard of scientific discussion is low; there are a great many impediments to the publication of new ideas and nonstandard thinking. Occasionally, ideas put forward here are not published in our journals; they reach us only through foreign journals. The Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences has had to prescribe from above that editorial offices open a discussion section in all scientific journals. The Lysenko virus lives on in scientific circles, whereby some people try to suppress dissident thinkers by using party and state organizations.

Everyone, including scientists, must be judged by what he does and by that alone. We should enhance the personal responsibility of the scientist for the work entrusted to him, and call him to account. [applause] This should exclude adventurism in science. For many years the specialist has been losing his professional honor. This has led to poorly thought out projects, damage to the environment, and accidents, which we will now find out about. This is a serious disease of our society. What it amonts to is that a whole era of so-called specialists has arisen, who are doing very well and who are always ready to justify and carry out almost any order from their bosses. However, this is the very thing that is impermissible. And it must be stopped, through broad glasnost of projects and expert assessments—this, too, is stated in the report—by inculcating a high sense of professional honesty right from school. [end recording]

Logunov Speech Published

PM0107155388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 6

[Speech by A.A. Logunov, rector of M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, at 30 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrades! Essentially, everything that is of vital importance has been said in Mikhail Sergeyevich's report. I will just dwell on a number of questions which are closest to my heart and which, in my opinion, are most important as regards science.

The first and most difficult is the successful implementation of a radical economic reform to help us advance in all strategically important areas so as to take our place among the leading economically developed countries. This clearly is no simple matter since our economic science has not enriched us with theoretical studies, and I felt this during the speech of our leading economist, Academician Abalkin. Evidently, much will have to be done by trial and error while constantly introducing corrections as we go along. True, there have been "masterworks" of the type of "The Economy Must Be Economical" in the preceding period.

The news media are citing many practical examples illustrating that ministries and departments are essentially unable or unwilling—we must establish which—to ensure the implementation of the economic reform and are thus undermining everything valuable that is enshrined in it. The report mentioned this as well. This means, however, that our top state organs by no means fully control the processes which are taking place in the

national economy. Unless we resolutely rectify this, we may end up in a critical situation, and there is not much time left. It follows from this that the party, its Central Committee, and the Politburo must not fail to keep all questions of controlling the progress of the economic reform at the focus of attention and act as a powerful catalyst in all these processes. In my opinion this is a most difficult task for the party, and the party is the only political force in our society which is capable of resolving this task.

The problems of the economy are questions which are of vital importance for everyone, and therefore we are entitled to receive more information from the Central Committee Economic Department about what is being done, how it is being done, what we may expect, and when. What is needed are theoretical forecasts based on an analysis of available experience.

Restructuring is the only way open to us, and there is no alternative. In my opinion, most people have grasped this. It is absolutely obvious that the people are supporting restructuring. Yet voices can sometimes be heard in society speaking of the need to defend restructuring. At first glance this appears to be a natural concern for the cause. Yet essentially it is a return to the old ways again, it is again a striving for primitive uniformity of thought. We have seen all this before.

It is true that in the past conditions greatly favored the multiplication of dogmatists and bureaucrats, including among young people. And they must not be underestimated, since restructuring means changing the mentality of every one of them. Unfortunately, this is a very slow process. Doing a job rather than just talking about it is the most difficult thing in life because it demands high professionalism and all-out effort. However, it was precisely these qualities that many people lost during the period of stagnation and that young people have not yet acquired—and, furthermore, life is demanding new approaches. And so many people in our country seem to want to supplant real work, which demands a serious effort, with combating someone or other, allegedly in the interests of the cause. That way they appear to be busy, struggling actively and even vigorously in the interests of the cause, as it were, but meanwhile the actual job is not being done. There are also very persistent attempts to find someone at the top who is against. This is then used to explain why restructuring is progressing so slowly. Yet spreading rumors and quoting well-informed people and suchlike are akin to the old ways, under which it was possible to deduce a great deal from the position which people occupied on the rostrum.

We don't seem to be able to change our mentality and grasp that discussion, even acrimonious discussion, is our weapon against conservatism and primitive uniformity of thought. All this indicates how deeply ingrained the stereotypes of the past are. We must overcome primitive thinking. The Central Committee and the Politburo must attentively follow all the processes which are taking place in society. Our desire to find a scapegoat is very great. (Applause). It will be sufficient involuntarily to encourage this process slightly and we will be flogging the opponents of restructuring—whom we are bound to find—just as we used to flog the cosmopolitans and so forth. And we all know well where all that ends.

Naturally, it is not the job of the party Central Committee to attend to day-to-day economic questions, but in practice as long as economic levers meant to stimulate the development of our economy and make it self-developing are not fully operational, the party cannot refrain from participating in the solution of these questions. Furthermore, many questions simply cannot be resolved without the Central Committee, as I know from my own experience.

Only through the development of economic science and its active translation into reality can the party focus its efforts on the strategic questions of social development.

To ensure the active participation of Central Committee members in this work it would seem expedient to establish sections within the Central Committee based either on the country's regions or various spheres of science. These sections could, in the period between Central Committee plenums, actively discuss questions which arise in the life of society and propose them for examination and solution. The Politburo could rely on the assistance of these sections in the preparation or discussion of specific questions, including cadre questions. This would contribute to the establishment of closer links between Politburo members, Central Committee secretaries, and the members of our party's Central Committee and would enhance the activeness and responsibility of Central Committee members in the solution of questions of party building.

Science and the training of highly educated cadres play a most important role in society. So far the situation in this sphere is not altogether favorable, or rather, to be more precise, is altogether unfavorable. First, we in science suffer, and have suffered for a long time, from the loss of many democratic traditions without which science cannot develop normally. The losses in science are very great and it is simply amazing that in a number of fields, especially theoretical fields, we are still keeping abreast, so to speak. Essentially, science has been a hollow word in our country: We have talked about it a great deal, we have allegedly done everything according to science, but we have done very little for its development. Many monopolist tendencies and much cliquishness have arisen in the sphere of science. The standard of scientific discussions is low and there are many obstacles hampering the publication of new ideas and nonstandard thoughts. Sometimes ideas which have originated in our country are not published in our journals but reach us via foreign journals.

The USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium had to issue an instruction from above to editorial offices to introduce a "Discussion" rubric in all scientific journals. The Lysenko virus is still alive in scientific circles, where certain people try to silence others who think differently with the help of party and state organs. However, since these organs are relatively wise at the moment, other, nonscientific ways of combating these people are being sought and attempts made, by all kind of subterfuges, to form a so-called majority opinion, and so forth. (Applause).

However, when it comes to scientific problems, questions are not resolved by a majority vote. Only substantiated criticism and facts can promote the development of science. In my opinion we can certainly claim a "leading" place among developed countries as regards the prevalence of the virus of conservatism in science. We find it much less disturbing to admit that someone abroad has made an interesting discovery rather than someone here. There is a great need for tolerance and for a coexistence of different schools of thought in our science. I have gained the impression from other speakers' speeches that this also applies among the writers and in other spheres. It is necessary to seek ways of cooperation rather than confrontation. Otherwise, we will not get far.

Of late we have gained an increasingly better understanding of the reasons for our lag in a number of scientific spheres. But what are we doing to overcome it? Above all, we are setting up new institutions without careful preparation, comprehensive discussion, or due regard for the availability of highly skilled cadres in a given sphere at a given time. And even the cadres question is sometimes resolved on the principle that, since a person has taken on a job, it is possible to elect him to the academy. This style gained currency in the late seventies. Sometimes academy members are appointed before anything has been achieved in a given sphere. Naturally, in some cases this pays off, but in general a more cautious, well-weighed approach is necessary. Practical work, and practical work alone, can serve as a yardstick in the assessment of anyone, and that includes scientists. The personal responsibility of scientists for the task with which they are entrusted must be enhanced and they must be made accountable. This does not, of course, exclude pure research, where results are practically impossible to predict.

However, a scientist must be strictly accountable for the promises he makes. We must inform the leaders of the party and the state honestly and accurately about our achievements and our shortcomings. And they, in turn, must check and check again the accuracy of this information before making use of it. This is to forestall adventurism in the sphere of science. There has been a loss of professional integrity on the part of experts for many years which has led to senseless projects, disruption of the ecological balance, and accidents about which we are hearing for the first time. This is a serious disease which has afflicted our society. Essentially, a whole galaxy of so-called specialists has emerged, thriving specialists who are always ready to substantiate or carry out almost any instruction from above. But it is precisely this which is impermissible. It has to be stopped by means of broad glasnost given to projects and expert assessments. And, as was noted in the report, by means of instilling high professional integrity. The loss of professionalism is also a disease afflicting science, and in certain circumstances a very dangerous disease.

It largely explains the loss of prestige of our science. What is the way out of this? Here is just one suggestion. What is needed is broad international scientific cooperation; we also need to send our talented students to study abroad, but not just individual students but many hundreds and possibly thousands of them.

Another, more difficult issue is the provision of our science with modern instruments, computers, and other specialized equipment. The situation in this area is very poor. For instance, the availability of personal computers in a number of countries abroad is almost comparable to the number of television sets, whereas we only have a small number of such computers. The level of development of informatics and information technology is still very low in our country despite the fact that this is a strategic avenue in the life of society!

In the sphere of mutual relations between fundamental science and industry everything has been turned topsy-turvy in our country. Many people in the leadership of party and state organs and even science itself have reached the totally erroneous conviction, based on individual successes in the application of scientific achievements, that scientists and fundamental science are capable of catapulting industry into leading positions. It is true that fundamental science can and must radically accelerate scientific and technical progress, but it will do so only if the economic mechanism of socialism forces industry by necessity to look to science and grab from it everything that is new and valuable. It is axiomatic, but fundamental science itself, in order to develop, needs a leading industry without which it cannot successfully advance. By gearing our industry to gross output in the past, we have condemned our fundamental science to decay. However, in order to ensure that fundamental science reaches leading positions radical, unorthodox measures in the state are necessary. It is necessary—and I see no other way—within the shortest possible time to provide the key strategic spheres of fundamental science on a competitive basis with everything they need. Without this we will fall hopelessly behind. A situation could arise where we no longer understand what is going on.

Everything that I have said about science also applies fully to higher education. Despite the fact that there is a Central Committee and Council of Ministers resolution on the restructuring of higher education, there have been no substantial improvements so far. We are absolute paupers as regards equipment and modern apparatus.

This is hampering the effective exploitation of the potential of VUZ science. There is a strong trend toward leveling among VUZ's despite the fact that they are very different. I have been authorized by the rectors of the country's universities to raise the question of establishing a university association to deal with all the key questions of university education in the country and also universities' international cooperation.

The Moscow University party aktiv has raised the question of granting Moscow University full autonomy in all its activities. Some people who spoke earlier said that they do not need a minister or a ministry. And we do not need the USSR State Committee for Public Education either. (Applause). This will untie the university's hands and eliminate unnecessary intermediate components. After all, we are quite capable of solving all day-to-day questions ourselves and, as for fundamental questions, we are having to resolve them with higher authorities anyway since none of them can be resolved by the USSR State Committee for Public Education. Even such a relatively minor question as the provision of the teaching process with leading Soviet computer equipment has to be referred directly to the USSR Minister of Finance, Comrade Gostev. I hope that he understands the importance of cadre training and will help us resolve this question.

On the subject of electivity I would like to say the following. All things considered, I favor two terms, with the exception of three state posts about which I have already spoken at a plenum. (Applause).

Melnikov Urges Gromyko Ouster

LD3006203088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Jun

[Report on speech by Komi Obkom First Secretary Melnikov at the 30 June session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow]

[Text] Taking part in the conference debates was Comrade Melnikov, first secretary of Komi Obkom. Here are some ideas he shared:

[Begin Melnikov recording] In the years of stagnation, so many problems accumulated in the ethnic regions that now they have to be worked on over and over again. This question must be regarded as a broad spectrum of our public life. Yes, of extreme importance is the development of the ethnic language and culture, but no less important is the development of social conditions, the conservation of the natural habitat and traditional achievements of each people. So the correct idea spoken by Mikhail Sergeyevich that a fight must be waged against national egoism and parochialism, needs very well-considered clarification. What is to be understood by national egoism if we, in the Komi Republic, oppose irrational approaches to spending natural resources and advocate a careful attitude toward the fragile northern habitat? Well, is that egoism or is it a civic-minded position?

It is not a question of failing to take the interests of the country into consideration; it is a question of the fact that in a short time we will not be able to stay on the bare earth. The most serious thing is that, supplying raw material to all union republics, the Komi SSR has lagged behind other regions in medical services, children's preschool institutions and schools, housing, communications facilities, and other social indices. All these negative phenomena have been the consequence of the residual principle of planning. Even today, in the period of restructuring, only 19 percent of all capital investment is channeled into the social sphere. This is lower than the average for the RSFSR and one of the worst indices for the northern economic region.

What is holding back the utilization of the republic's potential, its harmonious development? What is needed is a fundamentally new economic mechanism of management. We believe that such a mechanism must be the republic's transition to self-financing and self-recouping, [applause] which in our view, is fully in keeping with the tasks of cardinal economic reform. In our opinion, the existing practice of territorial siting of the productive forces must be based not only on technical-economic, but also ecological foundations. The time has come to carry out expert ecological surveys, with a broad study of public opinion and the participation of institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Very many requests and proposals have been made by the working people concerning conservation of the cleanliness of northern rivers, especially the Pechora. Only here in the Soviet Union can many kilometers of the lower reaches of the Pechora River be barred with wire netting, explaining that this is done to increase fish stocks, but even a fish has a head and it finds other spawning grounds; it simply goes off to the rivers of Scandinavian countries, while we will be losing unique salmon shoals in the near future, and all we will have to show for it will be wire netting as a monument to bungling and dozens of useless dissertations. [applause]

Selection, placing, and training of cadres is the essence of party leadership; but here, too, there have accumulated quite a few problems demanding practical solution. The commissar of restructuring is the man who is always to be found in the very midst of the masses, who knows their mood, and is able not only to listen but to persuade. Unfortunately, we prepare too few such commissars, and we do it badly. Glasnost in work with cadres must be broadened at all levels. Why, for example, are we still hiding behind the traditional formula of released in connection with retirement on pension, instead of naming the exact reason for replacement of many senior party workers? This not only harms the cause, it also diminishes the prestige of the party organ and the party as a whole. [applause]

The matter of selection and placing of cadres demands personal responsibility: such an appraoch should be extended to party committees, the Secretariat, and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. In our time of revolutionary transformations, the apparatus of the Communist Party Central Committee should as never before show an example in mastery of the Leninist style of leadership. Restructuring in the work of the Central Committee apparatus is proceeding slowly, however. In a whole series of major issues, there is evidence of a failure to consider things thoroughly, of haste, which leads not only to poor results in our practical activity, but also gives rise to new difficulties and problems. This has happened on more than one occasion already. Two examples are well-known: villages without a future and the fight against drunkenness, which have already been mentioned. In both cases, a great number of punishments have been meted out. Everywhere secretaries and chairmen have been questioned, compared with God knows what—but in the Central Committee, the initiators of these decisions, the ones who speeded them up, have in no way been held accountable. [applause]

They have all kept modestly quiet, stepped aside. Work started to restore the villages and eliminate sobriety zones. [sentence as heard] And I will say further, during discussion of the Theses we received a more categorical instruction from many Communists and nonparty people: Whoever in former times actively conducted the policy of stagnation should neither be nor work in the central party and local soviet organs. Everyone must be called to account, and personally! [applause]

[Gorbachev] Perhaps you have some specific suggestions to make? [laughter in audience] Otherwise, we are just sitting here without knowing whether this refers to me or to him.

[Melnikov] Mikhail Sergeyevich knows, I think. I was referring here to Comrade Solomentsev, in the first place, Gromyko, Afanasyev, Arbatov, and others. [applause] [end recording]

PRAVDA Account Published

PM0107144588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 6-7

[Speech by V.I. Melnikov, first secretary of Komi ASSR CPSU Obkom, at 30 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Delegates! Permit me to apologize to the comrades whom I referred to in my note yesterday as the "establishment" orators [shtatnyye oratory], although, as you can see, it has given me the opportunity to speak here today.

There is massive interest in the conference, and it is our task to extract any valuable idea from every speech so that it can be used for the benefit of restructuring. Comrade Kabaidze's emotional speech pushed Comrade Pugo's deeply meaningful speech on interethnic relations into the background. Unfortunately, there was a constant buzz among the audience while he was speaking, yet it was basically because of these very questions that the conference came together. (Applause)

The interethnic relations that exist in the Baltic republics are typical of many regions of the country, including our autonomous republic of Komi. During the stagnation years so many problems accumulated in the national regions that a great deal of work has to be done on them now. This issue must be seen as a broad spectrum of our social life. The development of national language and culture is extremely important, but equally so is the development of social conditions and the preservation of every people's natural habitat and traditional foundations. Therefore, the correct idea expressed by M.S. Gorbachev that it is necessary to fight against national egoism and parochialism needs very closely considered clarification. What does national egoism mean? If we in the Komi Republic oppose the unwise approach to the expenditure of natural resources and advocate care of the vulnerable northern natural environment, is this then egoism or a civic stand? It is not a matter of not taking the country's interests into account, it is a question of not being left with bare earth in the near future. Internationalism is not dogma, internationalism is a sacred and vital cause. It can be nourished by all the good and fine things contributed by each people.

Throughout our history the Komi Autonomous Republic has been a raw-material base for the industrial centers of the European part of the country. We possess major stocks of coal, oil, gas, timber, and many other valuable resources. But the position of raw-material region in no way suits us. The economy is suffering as a result, and most serious of all is the fact that, while supplying all the union republics with raw materials, the Komi ASSR has fallen behind many regions in terms of medical services, availability of children's preschool institutions and schools, housing, and communications facilities, and other social indicators. Everyone wants to take, but to give nothing in exchange. All these negative phenomena are the result of residual-principle planning, and even today, in the restructuring period, only 19 percent of all capital investments are being channeled into the social sphere. This is less than the average for the RSFSR as a whole and is one of the worst indicators in the Northern Economic Region. What is impeding the exploitation of the republic's potential and its harmonious development? A fundamentally new economic management mechanism is needed, and it seems to us that the mechanism should involve switching the republic to self-financing and cost recovery [samookupayemost], which fully conforms, in our view, to the tasks of fundamental economic reform. But now, ask the USSR State Committee for Statistics: Can it say how the economic potential in the Komi ASSR is operating? Is it beneficial to the state, is it paying its way, or is it consuming more?

Anxiety for the country's future economic development persists even here, at the conference, since we are going to be sent back again to solve all the questions on the spot. For the very rudiments of independence to be assimilated at local level it is necessary to give enterprises and territories the right to sell all products in excess of state orders on direct contracts, at contract prices, as has been discussed here. Nikolay Ivanovich, the USSR Council of Ministers must resolve to do this once and for all. And you will see that it will be entirely beneficial. After all, the miners got away from arbitrary planning, and they now have above-plan coal. But, apart from coal in Vorkuta, we have nothing to sell; no apples. So let us trade in coal. It is very important for our region. The directive organs have named our extractive industry products—that is, coal, gas, oil, timber—strategic raw materials, or scarce raw materials, and, as such, a 100-percent state order has been imposed. If we are given a vested interest in increasing production and supplies of products within the country, our state's might will not be undermined, but, I believe, will be considerably strengthened.

It is necessary to take further, bold steps in the development of foreign economic activity. Give the autonomous republic the right to decide independently to set up joint enterprises and international associations and organizations. We have the experience. Some 15,000 Bulgarian citizens are working in the joint Soviet-Bulgarian timber procurement association, tackling our countries' dual task. But in no way have we been able to reach the logical conclusion.

The provision laid down in the Theses on the need to step up efforts to protect the environment and implement comprehensive measures to radically improve the ecological situation in the country met with great support and approval among party organizations and labor collectives. Ecological problems are particularly acute in our northern areas. This is due to the extremely vulnerable northern natural environment. The marks made by the caterpillar tracks of all-terrain vehicles will take 20-30 years to heal. Therefore, the Communists and working people of the republic have expressed valid concern about the preservation of reindeer pastures and the taiga, whose forest tracts are in danger of disappearing in the next 15-20 years. The taiga is being mercilessly hacked down on the pretext of providing the national economy with timber. In our view the existing practice of territorial siting of productive forces should be based on ecological as well as on technical and economic considerations. The time has come to carry out an objective expert ecological examination of projects, involving extensive study of public opinion and with the participation of USSR Academy of Sciences institutes.

There have been a great number of requests and proposals from working people on maintaining the purity of the northern rivers, particularly the Pechora. Only here, in the Soviet Union, could you have a situation where many kilometers of the lower reaches of the Pechora are dammed with wire netting, the explanation being that it has been done to increase fish stocks. But fish have heads, too. So they simply go off to rivers in the Scandinavian countries in search of other spawning grounds and, in the very near future, we will lose our unique salmon populations but will have instead the wire netting as a monument to bungling and dozens of useless dissertations. (Applause)

The selection, placement, and education of cadres is the essence of party leadership. But here, too, there has accumulated a multitude of problems requiring practical solution. The commissar of restructuring is a person who is ever in the midst of the masses, who knows their mood and is capable not only of listening but of persuading, too. Unfortunately, we are training such commissars badly and in insufficient numbers. Training of journalist cadres is unsatisfactory, also. Isn't this the main reason for the large number of errors and incorrect opinions in our press publications?

There is yet another problem, in my view. CPSU Central Committee departments ought to arrange systems work with newly elected secretaries of union republic Communist Party central committees and party kraykoms and obkoms; and it is necessary to organize probationary periods for them in the Central Committee departments, the timely publication of literature on advanced experience, and the exchange of experience between our party and the socialist countries' communist parties. In order to intensify work with cadres we support the proposal to provide for departments for work with cadres in party kraykoms and obkoms as part of the changes in party committee structure. It is necessary to expand glasnost in work with cadres at all levels. Why, for example, do we still take refuge behind the traditional formula "released in connection with his retirement on pension," without naming the precise reason for the replacement of many party workers? This not only damages the cause but diminishes the authority of the party organ and the party as a whole. (Applause)

The election and placement of cadres demands personal responsibility. This approach should be extended to party committees and the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat and Politburo. In our time of revolutionary transformations the Communist Party Central Committee apparatus must more than ever before set an example of mastery of the Leninist leadership style. But restructuring in the work of the Central Committee apparatus is a slow process. A whole series of very important questions have been given sketchy, hasty treatment, which leads not only to poor results in our practical activity but also gives rise to new difficulties and problems. This has happened more than once now.

Two well-known examples: villages without a future and the fight against drunkenness, which have already been talked about. In both cases a great number of punishments have been meted out locally. Secretaries and chairmen have had to give accounts of themselves all

over the place and have been compared to all manner of things! But in the Central Committee the people behind these decisions and those who pushed them through have not borne any personal responsibility. (Applause)

They have all observed a modest silence, taking a back seat. People have started resurrecting the villages and eliminating the "sober zones." During the discussion of the Theses we received a more categorical mandate from many Communists and nonparty people: Anyone who actively pursued the stagnation policy in the past cannot be a member of and work in a central party or soviet body now, in the period of restructuring. They have to answer for everything and answer personally. (Applause)

M.S. Gorbachev: Perhaps you have some specific suggestions to make? (animation in the auditorium) Or are we to sit here without knowing whether it refers to me, or to him?

V.I. Melnikov: I would include Comrade M.S. Solomentsev, above all, and Comrades A.A. Gromyko, V.G. Afanasyev, G.A. Arbatov, and others. (Applause)

There is another thought I must share—in conditions of the rapidly developing process of democratization and discussion of the Theses there have been many people who have been deliberately molding public opinion to the effect that the party is peopled entirely by bureaucrats and officials and enjoys wall-to-wall privileges. Of course, to our shame, there have been bribe-takers and bureaucrats in the party apparatus (and maybe still are even now). But they are a tiny fraction, and it is wrong to tar with the same brush all party officials, the vast majority of whom have but one privilege in their work—that of toiling for 12-14 hours a day, without regard for their health and without the usual days off—and let the party Central Committee concern itself with the other privileges. (Applause) And whereas there used to be a sense of moral satisfaction in work, now, in the restructuring period, it can be dispelled. The authority of the party cannot exist without the authority of the party official. And everyone, including—Mikhail Sergeyevich—the general secretary of our party, must work to strengthen his authority, to enhance it. (Applause)

Yet another thought that worries Communists and working people in our region: At the end of the twenties the Komi Republic, because of its geographical position, was designated a place for criminals to serve their sentences. Major corrective labor camps were sited there. There are still a large number of colonies on the republic's territory. Moreover, Vlasovites, Ukrainian and Lithuanian nationalists, and traitors were exiled there. And this was bound to affect the moral and psychological climate of the region. Many of them stay and take up residence in the republic on being released from prison. But not all of them completely sever links with the past, so there is a high level of recidivism in our region. Our population is rightly complaining. Why do we tolerate this situation? Why do exiles from enterprises in Moscow and Gorkiy have to be reeducated on our sovkhozes and forestry farms? Aren't the Likhachev Automobile Plant or the Gorkiy Automobile Plant, for example, capable of handling their own couple of dozen hooligans? (Applause) We believe that this practice must be changed. Convicts must serve their terms of punishment in the places where the crimes were committed. Then family and labor collective will be able to contribute to corrective measures and reeducation.

On behalf of the Komi Republic delegates, I support the provisions of the report as the party's businesslike, intensive program for the revolutionary transformation of our socialist society. During the discussion the republic produced more than 13,000 proposals, amplifications, and observations. They were all submitted to the conference. The cause demands that not a single valuable proposal be overlooked, gather dust in the safe, or end up by not being considered. Anything valuable and practical is bound to benefit restructuring. (Applause)

Patiashvili on Leadership

PM0107151388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 7

[Speech by D.I. Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, at 30 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! The revival of the Leninist tradition of holding an all-union party conference is a natural stage of our party's post-April course. Glasnost and democratization have marked profound changes in public thinking. And so the points in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report have fallen on fertile psychological and moral ground, and political thought is consistently being transformed into real experience of restructuring.

The decisions that the people await from us are a question of the party's prestige, of the strengthening of its political leadership in society. The ideas of the 27th congress are being realized today not in terms of formal indicators but in the broadening of political and economic initiative. Economic accountability [khozraschet] has made it possible to estimate the potential of the human factor at its true worth. One-third of enterprises in the republic are now working under conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing. They produce approximately half of all industrial output and fulfill the profit plan. Unfavorable weather and other factors have complicated economic growth somewhat, and more than R400 million has dropped out of the national income in the space of 2 years just because of a change in the production structure. But the changes have been appreciable, including in technical updating and improved quality.

Enterprise is shaping new incentives, the effect of the lease contract is convincing, and 1,500 cooperatives are partly making up a certain gap in the satisfaction of the public demand. It would, of course, be naive to assume that manifestations of conservatism have been eradicated in the republic and that there are no stagnation phenomena left. They have put down deep roots in agriculture (as mentioned in the report) and in other sectors and spheres of activity. This lack of boldness and determination in rejecting obsolete cliches in the economy is also felt acutely.

Sociopolitical activeness is growing. Thus concern for national culture and language has united representatives of the intelligentsia, the working class, and the countryside, people of different nationalities and different views in the recently created Rustaveli Society. Glasnost and democratization have clearly revealed the diversity and richness of our society and its tremendous social reserves. I will not deny that the stormy activity in discussing the Central Committee Theses and electing the conference delegates put many leaders and party organs in a very difficult or, rather, unusual position. But let such difficulty teach us to live in harmony with democratic principles. Let this be the first step! There is no alternative to the present course, and it is extremely important now, in our view, to seek to consolidate all healthy forces on a restructuring platform.

It is a long time since our society had such a magnificent opportunity, without political hypocrisy, to rally people, to dethrone the monopoly of the word, and to ensure genuine like-mindedness with all the diversity of approaches and views.

What is the secret? What are the reasons? How has it come about in general that a monumental edifice has been erected on Leninist foundations which, nonetheless, is having to be restructured so thoroughly? There are many assessments. The essence is the same—this stems from the mechanism of power.

A democratic mechanism gravitates toward democratization. The bureaucratization of power gives rise to arbitrary rule and inevitably elevates the means over the end. The personality cult was a serious lesson for the party and society. They were years when tragedies and heroism, lofty ideas and base actions were inseparably interwoven. And flights toward the heights of civilization and morality alternated with falls into the gloom of the feudal Middle Ages. The public in the republic is now voicing its opinion—and our Leningrad comrades raised this issue yesterday—on the creation of a monument to all who suffered innocently during those years. However, separating Stalin and Stalinism means simplifying history and the natural laws of its development. It means protecting the very mechanism of power, which, continuing to gain in strength, is capable of rubber-stamping new cults great and small. It means exterminating one personality cult only to preserve the totalitarian cult of the apparatus of power, which no less ruthlessly emasculates critical thinking and public intellect and defends tooth and nail the administrative-edict structure of socialism, breeding lack of control, connivance, and stagnation and transforming politics and morality. Was it not a dangerous and immoral apparatus that willingly kept an incapable leader on his feet in both the literal and figurative senses, bred mutual covering up, and passed all decisions without hindrance: ranging from the creation of a ministry for relatives and friends to the postponement of a party congress? And yet we witnessed all this! (Applause)

The apparatus has a tremendous instinct for and experience of survival. Its stagnant nature is the chief brake on restructuring. Here some people are trying to carry out even restructuring using the usual administrative-edict methods. There is the same old mentorship tone and naked didacticism. And sometimes even the same old ties which prevented people from drowning but greatly hamper their ability to keep afloat.

Is this not why we are overcoming stagnation in practical spheres far more slowly than in thinking? Is this not why the principle "everything is permitted that is not prohibited" is creating utter confusion in administrative offices? Is this not why so much froth has appeared on the waves of glasnost, and demagogues and windbags do not always receive a proper rebuff? No, it is impossible to painlessly wash clean a stained reputation and conscience, and cleansing is impossible without agonizing overcoming, ruthless self-analysis, and sincere repentance. The movie "Repentance" by conference delegate Tengiz Abuladze deals with just this. Is this not why the call for repentance, which came into being toward the end of the stagnation period and was heard at the very beginning of restructuring, has become a phenomenon of artistic creativity? It is not a call to supporters of the cult. It is a call to all of society. It is a call to every one of us.

And it is time, finally, to reveal more fully the situation in the party on the eve of the CPSU Central Committee March (1985) Plenum; to show the abyss on whose edge we were standing, in order to better realize that the only correct decision was made, in order to understand the tremendous political courage demanded by the shift toward democratization. (Applause)

It is possible to improve the channels of power only by laying the foundations of the formation of a really civilized democratic mechanism of management of the party and of society so that a leading post does not become an object of idealization and admiration, and so that there is a clear guarantee that effective decisions are made, not by authority of office but by authority of intellect.

This is why we wholly support the so acutely urgent proposals for improving the soviet political system. Increasing the role of the soviets and ideologizing the party leadership is an effective way to strengthen the democracy of the whole people.

At the same time it is no less important to deepen democratism in the very style of our life, work, and management and to broaden trust in every possible way. From being a factor of human relations, trust is increasingly developing into an important category of political, economic, and social life. A circular letter of instruction frequently results from illiteracy and laziness, the inability to go into details, and a reluctance to get to know the matter and people better. This is the right road into the swamp of connivance and stagnation. But trust and mutual respect mean knowledge of people, competence, high professionalism, and education. Such trust and mutual respect are still clearly in short supply in cadre policy, where the obsolete "nomenklatura" style is at odds with the elective system. And therefore it is difficult to overcome the administrative-bureaucratic interpretation of the unified national economic complex. Sometimes there are requests but no corresponding visas. You will not awaken enterprise by means of bans. Endless reports, agreements, and visas have become an end in itself for people who are frequently responsible for nothing specific. And excessive centralization enables bureaucrats at the center and locally to close ranks, standing like a wall across the paths of democratization. This is why it is so important to deprive the apparatus of the physical possibility of exercising bureaucratic diktat and preventing self-management.

The new model of political leadership makes it possible to oppose undemocratic administration in the sphere of interethnic relations, where it is perceived particularly painfully. Due tribute has to be paid to our successes in enhancing the national self-awareness and culture of all nations and peoples. In Georgia alone teaching is in eight languages. Newspapers, magazines, and books are published in six languages, and radio programs are broadcast in seven. We really have something to be proud of before the civilized world. But the further development of interethnic relations must take place with due regard for this growth on a mature basis. The creation of a multinational legal state must begin with the nations' genuine equality of rights, as enshrined in the USSR Constitution. The priority of law can undoubtedly lead to changes in our Fundamental Law. But there is a still more urgent need—and this has been pointed out—for a mechanism guaranteeing the strict implementation of the provisions of the constitution.

Trust and mutual understanding are a decisive factor for also deepening democratism in the interethnic sphere. Vladimir Ilich Lenin regarded consistent democratism in strengthening and developing Soviet national statehood as "the only step toward equality and democracy in practice." The shaping of an internationalist mentality today is directly linked with the improvement of Soviet federalism as understood by Lenin and with the strengthening of our common native home—the equal Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of all nations and peoples.

This concerns the whole range of socioeconomic relations, including regional economic accountability—a most important condition for overcoming freeloading and dilettantism. Under contemporary conditions no people can develop fully without proper economic responsibility.

It is very important to value and respect national traditions and feelings and to have clear ideas of the history of the peoples' culture. However, many comrades and also organs are sometimes far better informed about certain foreign states than about our country's republics and national regions. We must all get to know each other in greater depth, associate with each other more frequently, enter into living contacts, and place greater value on our unique gains and the peoples' friendship and fraternity, and not cloud them by precipitate deeds and actions. (Applause)

This is why it is so important in the course of restructuring to persistently form new incentives and goals for the Soviet peoples' political cohesion. Perhaps the structure of party and soviet organs should also be reconsidered in this sphere. Precisely our party, international in essence, must act today as the chief guarantor of the fundamental and sacred assets of the national spirit—originality, culture, and language. This, too, is a question of our authority.

The dignity of the Soviet person is underpinned as a whole by the dignity and respect of the nation. There is a whole host of things to do here. If even legal organs are frequently incapable of acting in accordance with legal methods, this means that we are still apprentices of restructuring. It is necessary to educate a generation of people whose ideological maturity is underpinned by social emancipation and creative liberation. Young people must be actively involved in formulating all major decisions and be more widely represented at our congresses and conferences. For everything that is being done today—restructuring, glasnost, self-purification—all this is for the future generations!

Objectivity, balance, and restraint are needed. The press, television, radio, and periodicals, as has rightly been said here, must not encourage the manifest lack of culture, shortsightedness, and illiteracy of certain authors. It is time people learned, finally, to be fully responsible for their words and their consequences. They must not disregard the country's multinational nature and specific situations where apparently totally harmless historical maps acquire aggressive outlines and a phrase that crops up at odd moments, as it were, about the fatiguing Georgian cacophony [mnogogolosye] excites the public and is perceived almost as another echo of the cult. Television and the press, on which the fate of restructuring largely depends, must further strengthen trust and love and further propagandize the culture and history of our peoples.

Another thing that we still really lack is cultural awareness in the very best sense of the world. This is where our losses are particularly great and immeasurable! For years

our intelligentsia was being encroached upon under conditions of a militant authoritarian system. And if we really want reliable guarantees against relapses into vulgar authoritarianism and precipitate arbitrariness, we must elevate our intelligentsia, help it to occupy its proper place in the political system, and not leave a considerable intellectual section of our society outside the party for formal reasons. (Applause)

Politics and morality must be combined, and politics, the economy, and society as a whole must be made moral. This is the meaning and goal of restructuring.

The radical shift in political thinking, the changes within the country, and the active foreign policy have changed both us and the world surrounding us, which has already become different and not so aggressive and alienated. People are looking at us with hope, and a sense of patriotic pride in our country and our party is emerging. You are really beginning to feel that, indeed, only now has socialism begun to really reveal its tremendous potential in a Leninist fashion, and restructuring and glasnost have been elevated as the humanitarian goal. It has fallen to our generation to live and work at a very complex, crucial, and responsible stage in the development of Soviet society, when it is regaining its lost vanguard role in social progress. And we must be worthy of the lofty mission which history has entrusted to our party, our people, and every Communist. (Applause)

Starodubtsev Chides Ministries

PM1007160588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 7

[Speech by V.A. Starodubtsev, chairman of the "Novomoskovskoye" Agro-Industrial Association, at 30 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! The entire Soviet people and all party organizations who delegated us to the 19th all-union party conference expect very serious decisions that would assist us to resolve an entire mass of problems that have accumulated in recent times.

Today we say that these years are revolutionary ones, years of serious restructuring in our politics and economy. But, comrades, if we are honest, and we must be absolutely honest in this hall and on this platform, for revolutionary times things are awfully quiet in virtually all circles. There are no stormy currents, there are no "cast-iron" decisions in the struggle against negative phenomena, there is no progress in the economy, and stagnation continues, at least at present.

The 1st day of the conference really made many people, myself included, feel depressed that everything would continue in the old way. To our delight, each day the conference work inspires more and more hope. I would like to make the following points. I think that it is impossible today to carry out restructuring seriously without severely assessing those who have prevented us from living and working for decades. (Applause)

We are talking about monuments to the victims of Stalinism. Yes, we will erect these monuments. But how will we punish those people who created malicious lawlessness and who destroyed the flower of our nation? I think that there is no point today talking about that vengeance which they used once against our country's front rankers. But today we should be talking about the moral and material liability of those people. The point is that everyone must know them and know that at one time they trampled on human laws, and at one time they dealt arbitrarily with party laws. They should be deprived of their personal pensions, and ultimately they should be called to account. (Applause)

In the years of stagnation—as this period is called, but it could have been called something other than the years of stagnation—we sustained very heavy economic and moral losses. The people who created this stagnation crushed everything sacred we had, everything we had achieved in the difficult battles, revolutionary battles, and everything gained in the Great Patriotic War.

The people stopped believing, the people stopped working. Today it is difficult to rouse people to work as industriously as they worked after the 1917 revolution. Today our task is to find solutions so that the people will finally believe us and start to genuinely resolve the national economic tasks and scale new world heights. (Applause)

I would also like to stress the following point. Our state has created a caste of untouchables. I am referring to prominent party and state workers who under this shameful label, so to speak, retired on a pension after they had committed very serious crimes or breaches of the norms of party life and Soviet laws. Today they have personal pensions, large apartments and they are smugly looking on, watching closely to see what will happen next. I think we should give an assessment of this phenomenon. (Applause)

A few words, comrades, about a problem, a painful problem, which has emerged in our state. This is the Food Program. It was given several different names but the essence of the work has not changed to this day. I think that the reasons that gave rise to this program, this problem, are well known. They are the difficult years of forcible collectivization; the country's industrialization the brunt of which was shouldered by the peasants; the war when 8 out of 10 people in the trenches were peasants; the victory over the postwar ruin because again the burden was mainly shouldered by the peasants. There are probably many among us in this hall who are of peasant stock, and some still work in the countryside to this day. We recall how we worked completely for free,

how we had no vacations, no days off, how we had no pensions and so on. Everything that the peasants used to have has today been given back to the people, it has been given back to the state.

But I spoke at the kolkhoz members' congress and once again I am obliged to say: Dear comrades! I address this to everyone: the working class, the intelligentsia, everyone. Is it worthwhile refraining for so long from repaying your debts to us? It is time to repay us at least part of the debt, and then we will wipe any kind of food program from the agenda. (Applause)

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov—chairman of our state's Council of Ministers—spoke very warmly about this at a Supreme Soviet session and gave a generally objective assessment of the whole peasantry. I would like our government and Central Committee to finally move from words to specific deeds and resolve urgent problems in our country's agrarian sector. The following are essential for this: Stable, economically valid prices, and a solution to questions of constructing roads, accommodation, and cultural and consumer facilities. Strange as it may seem, comrades, questions of resettling people from the town to the countryside need to be resolved.

To our great shame, not far from Moscow a virgin land has formed where there is virtually no one left, and there is no one to do the work. This particularly affects the northwestern oblasts, and Kalinin and other oblasts in the non-Chernozem zone. If we do not resolve this question, then it will be difficult to resolve the Food Program. (Applause)

Comrades, as concerns the bureaucratic apparatus, and a lot has been said about it from this rostrum, attempts have been made to find this bureaucrat; I think that this bureaucrat has many faces, amounting to an entire system. This system is so complicated and so invulnerable that resolving to cut it back by half or by one fourth is virtually impossible because the bureaucratic apparatus is capable of reproducing itself, however much we cut it back, it keeps on growing.

I will cite just one example. Comrade Postnikov spoke from the rostrum about the "Stavropolskoye" Association. Great success was achieved there. This association is operating on the basis of self-management and this indicates yet again that there is no need to have many ministries and departmental offices, but there should be powerful self-managing collectives capable of resolving the most complicated tasks. With this aim our government decided that the "Novomoskovskoye" Agro-Industrial Association be set up. It was indeed created as an enterprise operating on the basis of self-management, self-recoupment, and self-financing. But, comrades, before setting up this association we had to go through all the torments of Hell, and if I was asked to go through all this again, I would not do even half of it because when we drew up the documents (in accordance with the Council of Ministers' resolution and the regulations of our association), all the departments—the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Finance, Gosbank, and Gosplan—blocked the path of this document, and only the direct intervention of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov helped us to organize these documents and set up our association that is working successfully today. This is one more example that shows that all enterprises need to be switched to self-management and self-recoupment and that the tasks of the territory and directly of each oblast and republic need to be resolved, and this will be successfully resolved only if we do not bow to the Ministry of Finance and so on.

I think it is essential to recall one more point. Today the Ministry of Finance and Gosbank have a kind of power that is binding the hands and feet of everything living, and permit neither the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, nor other enterprises to budge. (Applause) Comrades, matters have reached the point where voluntary insurance of crops, and other property has now turned into a kind of agricultural tax, and whether we want to insure or not, they take this money from us with no arguing.

If we expect help from you, from the working class, from everyone, then the latest government resolution once again puts us, as they say, in a very difficult and grave position. Telegrams are coming in from everywhere saying that in exchange for the enlistment of workers to do the harvesting and carry out agricultural work, we must not only reimburse then the value of these agricultural operations but also reimurse them their wages at their place of work and the benefits that they effectively lose. If such approaches continue, the Food Program will not be resolved very rapidly. (Applause)

Comrades! In conclusion, I would like to say the following. We must make the kind of decisions that would put an end once and for all to all our negative phenomena. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

Razumovskiy on Bribe-Taking Issue

LD3006104588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Following a short break, the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference resumed its work. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, who is chairing this session, gave the floor to Comrade Razumovskiy for a brief from the Credentials Commission. Here is what its chairman reported:

[Begin Razumovskiy recording] Comrades! In accordance with the instructions of the conference, the Credentials Commission, at a special session on this issue and with the participation of the relevant specialists and officials, has examined an article in OGONEK magazine concerning accusations of bribe-taking by certain conference delegates. As the USSR procurator general reports,

the USSR Procuracy has not adopted any decision on bringing criminal charges for bribe-taking and other crimes against any of the persons elected as delegates to the conference. [applause] The information presented in the article entitled "Resistance" [Protivostoyaniye] needs to be carefully checked. In the opinion of the Credentials Commission, this should be done by the USSR Procurator General and the Party Control Committee of the CPSU Central Committee. They should report the results, but this will of course take time. Quite thorough investigations must be carried out. [end recording]

The delegates suggested that the floor be given to Korotich, editor in chief of OGONEK magazine, for an explanation.

The debates on the report were continued by Comrade (?Ramazanov), a steel worker of the Karaganda Metallurgical Works.

Statement Stirs Audience Reaction

LD3006204888 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 30 June, during its "Vremya" newscast, carries a 3-minute item on a statement delivered to the 30 June session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference by G.P. Razumovskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the conference Credentials Committee. The announcer notes that the session was chaired by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

Razumovskiy is seen making his statement, at the conclusion of which he removes his glasses and turns in preparation to step down from the rostrum. Murmuring is heard in the hall, whereupon Razumovskiy returns to the microphone and adds: "But this will take time, of course. This cannot be done in the context of the Credentials Committee's proceedings, of the Credentials Committee's session. Quite thorough investigations must be carried out."

A shout is heard from the floor: "Why does the editorial office publish unverified facts?" More shouts follow. Agitated members of the audience are seen as Razumovskiy is heard saying: "Am I being asked a question?"

Shcherbitskiy is then shown saying: "Comrades, are there any questions for Comrade Razumovskiy?" Shouts of "No" from the audience are heard, and Shcherbitskiy continues: "No? Are we noting that?"

A voice from the hall is heard: "There are questions. The editorial office must be asked to speak and explain what this is all about." There were shouts of "Hear, hear!", and applause.

Shcherbitskiy responds: "From what I understood, Comrade Korotich should be asked to speak, isn't that so?" Laughter is heard, and Shcherbitskiy continues: "Comrades, let's carry on our proceedings, while Comrade Korotich makes his way down here."

CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, who is seen seated near Shcherbitskiy says: "Let him speak next!"

Shcherbitskiy is then seen introducing the next scheduled speaker, Ramazanov from the Karaganda Metallurgical works.

Razumovskiy is seen standing on the rostrum throughout most of the exchange, and shouts of "Hear, hear" as well as applause are repeatedly heard.

OGONEK's Korotich Responds

LD3006135488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] [Announcer] On the rostrum at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference is Vitaliy Korotich, editor in chief of OGONEK magazine:

[Begin recording] [Korotich] Esteemed comrades, you are aware—many of you obviously have read it—of an article published in our magazine. I am very grateful to the Credentials Commission for taking up the examination of this issue. When we were approached by the investigators—the juridical generals, so to speak—Comrades [name indistinct] and Ivanov, who are in charge of the whole Rashidov mafia case and who are now dealing with the Churbanov case, put forward certain evidence and certain problems. They said that some of the people involved in these cases, some of the people against whom a large quantity of evidence has been collected, can in no way be prosecuted. They said that it is within the authority of the investigation to inform the party bodies that such-and-such serious suspicions toward a Communist exist and that preparations are being made to proceed against him in such-and-such a case.

As a rule, the case of a Communist, especially a fairly highly placed Communist, does not go to court without the party bodies having examined the question of his party position. During the last few years the people in charge of the investigation have made reports on more than one occasion to the CPSU Central Committee in this connection, and most recently letters about this were sent on the eve of the conference. I have brought with me an account of the investigation group dealing with cases of special importance under the USSR prosecutor general and a list of all approaches made to the CPSU Central Committee requesting that the level of party responsibility of these people be examined so that they can be brought to account under criminal procedures.

What we have is a vicious circle. People who cannot be made answerable cannot be condemned; and since they have not been condemned they cannot be accused of anything; and so on.

I very much would like, as has been proposed, the party Control Committee and the USSR Procuracy General to finally provide an assessment of what is being said by the investigators and either punish the people we are talking about, or punish the investigators and journalists who have allowed themselves to bring suspicion upon innocent people. [applause]

[Shcherbitskiy] There is a proposal from the Credentials Commission which has been put forward by Comrade Razumovskiy. [indistinct voices heard from the floor]

[Korotich] Certainly.

[Shcherbitskiy] I cannot hear.

[Korotich] The four individuals listed in this document are conference delegates. [murmurs in the hall] I cannot say—in the case in question I would like to—but the presumption really does exist, and judging by what has been shown and said by the procuracy, these people are guilty, but I am unable to determine that. They are handing this over for the party liability of these people, in the first place, because the data about their bribe taking are being handed over by the procuracy. I have handed over the names. [end recording]

[Announcer] Comrade Shcherbitskiy, who was in the chair, proposed that the conference be guided in this question by the recommendations of Comrade Razumovskiy, the chairman of the Credentials Commission, having taken note of the statement by Comrade Korotich.

Romazanov's Conference Speech

PM0307121188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 8

[Speech by K.Z. Romazanov, steel smelter at the Karaganda Metallurgical Combine, at 30 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrades! On sending me off to the conference, the metallurgical workers of Kazakhstan's Magnitka, the miners of Karaganda, and the rural working people, construction workers, and chemical industry workers of Central Kazakhstan instructed me to say on their behalf that the spirit of restructuring and renewal, which imbues every item in the Central Committee Theses is near and dear to workers and party officials alike.

I would like to touch on just some questions that I and my comrades find the most perturbing today. We judge changes in society by specific deeds. If there is a change for the better, it means that the correct course has been chosen. Today there are real conditions enabling all Communists and all working people to participate in state and public affairs. More information is available about the work and concerns of party committees; successes and failures alike are taken more to heart. There has been good progress in the development of glasnost and democracy. This is the 2d year that our combine has been operating under the conditions of economic reform. Economic accountability is being introduced. People have started thinking about the value of the rubles they earn, about their responsibility to their partners. Instead of being the routine concern of the marketing department, questions of contract deliveries are now the focus of attention by all, from steel smelter to the director.

The fact that for more than 6 months now the combine has been steadily fulfilling its contract deliveries is due not only to the technologists who have managed to clear choke points in all steel conversion process sectors, but also to the party committee having convinced everybody not by declarations and slogans but by its own attitude that it is impossible to continue working in the old style, that failure can have a negative effect on any enterprise's work not only within its own sphere but also far beyond its confines. After all, our technical-grade rolled metal sections, tin plate, and other products are delivered to more than 7,000 consumers. This touches on ideological aspects and interethnic relations, about which so much is being said today. I and all our metallurgical workers learn with aching hearts any news about complications in the nationalities issues. I'll be honest: We do not always understand the reasons behind such developments. In the workers' milieu, the nationalities question is solved somewhat more simply. As people say, internationalism at an open-hearth furnace or at a mine face is recognized by the corns on the hands and the firm supporting shoulder of your friend. (Applause)

The men, as a rule, are indignant when we start calculating how many representatives of various nationalities are to be found in various links. There is only one criterion here—one's attitude toward the job. In my view, and in order to have fewer discussions on this topic, we all must resolve in an honest and businesslike fashion the question of social justice in the broadest sense of the word. The moral climate in a collective and in places of residence also depends on how intensively the economic reform is being introduced.

Take a question like social activeness. In our combine we set up labor collective councils made up not of formal leaders but of ardent champions of restructuring. They ardently got down to business, but their ardor soon died away. The new Law on the State Enterprise has simply failed to work in full; it has been ensnared by ministerial instructions, recommendations, and directives. Even before the ink at the foot of the law had dried, numerous restrictions appeared that reduce economic independence to zilch. First, the combine was notified of state orders covering 100 percent of its output, followed by the

strictest ban on independent distribution of above-plan metal. There immediately appeared an instruction on the normative distribution of profits, as a result of which we are left with less than one-third of the funds we have earned. If you take into account the fact that our coking batteries have been in operation for 24 years (in other words virtually at the end of their serviceable life) and that the No 8 coking battery has been under construction for 6 years now (with no ray of hope in sight), we will have to allocate the lion's share of profits to the production development fund. Like it or not, the social sphere is once again on the residuary side. This situation is typical not only of our own enterprise but also of chemical industry workers and coal miners.

For decades on end, social, cultural, and consumer services facilities for workers in Karaganda and Temirtau were kept on meager rations from the ministry. After the 27th party congress we hoped that the hopelessly neglected social sphere would be successfully boosted through the new economic reform. But this was not to be, the residuary principle is still being applied.

During meetings with working people prior to our departure for the conference, I and all Karaganda delegates found it difficult to answer questions concerning the ecological situation. The ecological situation in our region is under strain now, the annual per capita emission of pollutants has reached 4 tonnes, and this includes numerous harmful substances like benzene, mercury, phenol, hydrogen cyanide, and others. Dead zones extending over tens of kilometers have formed around enterprises like the Karaganda Metallurgical Combine, "Rezinotekhnika," "Karagandatsement," and the "Karbid" Association.

Some 50 years ago the Karaganda steppes were thinly populated and the harsh climate did not favor the development of agriculture. Ministries were eager to build their enterprises here, seeing that they could effect savings by scimping on purification installations.

The situation has changed now, dozens of cities and hundreds of sovkhozes have sprung up. But the barbaric treatment of nature continues. When it comes to environmental protection, union ministries get away with half measures. At this point I would like to second the speech by my colleague, the metallurgical worker from Nizhniy Tagil. One gets the impression that there is no real force in the USSR Council of Ministers that could compel them to face up to the oblast's ecological and social problems. Time is passing, the situation is not improving, the number of sick people is growing, while ministerial paperwork in the Gosplan erects barriers in the way of the promised gas pipeline from Tyumen that would solve many of Central Kazakhstan's problems, including ecological problems. The construction of environmental protection facilities is being pushed onto the back burner. At this point, I would also like to add that the Karaganda Metallurgical Combine is the only combine that lacks local natural gas.

There is another question. Ours is an industrial oblast. It is located in a zone of risky agriculture. Only 12 percent of the population, including 8 percent of the working population, live in the countryside. The base of agriculture, storage, and processing is weak. It is simply beyond the rural residents' capacity to feed the workers and urban residents under these conditions. The so-called 358th CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Further Improvement of the Economic Management Mechanism in the USSR Agro-Industrial Complex," adopted in 1986, put us, and evidently other industrial oblasts, in clearly disadvantageous conditions.

Store shelves in neighboring agricultural oblasts are groaning under the weight of meat, sausages, and other agricultural products, even though they may be from cooperatives. But they are unwilling to send their above-plan output to us, referring to this resolution. True enough, their leaders are not averse to sharing with us, but in exchange they ask for our above-plan output of metal, coal, and cement. But, as I already mentioned, we are fettered by 100-percent state orders, and all our above-plan output is taken care of by the Gosplan. And so, metallurgical and chemical industry workers, miners, and construction workers can do nothing but travel 200-300 km to buy foodstuffs in neighboring oblasts. This is not right, this is not a state-minded approach. We heard correct remarks about breaches of the principles of social justice in this respect, about a certain unpublicized clash of interests of residents of industrial and agricultural oblasts.

Comrades! Our delegation has brought along a whole package of proposals by Communists and nonparty members who took part in the discussion of the Central Committee Theses. More than 7,000 remarks and proposals were received during the discussion of this document, even though people criticized the Central Committee for allocating only 1 month for the discussion of such an important question. This time was evidently not enough. All participants in the debate were unanimous that it is necessary to resolutely enhance the leading and guiding role of the party at this crucial stage of restructuring. We entirely and fully agree with this stance by the CPSU Central Committee, as outlined in the report. We must not allow the upper hand to be gained by demagogues and those who would like to exorcize restructuring, who forget the main point—that its success depends on every person's new attitude to labor. And it is we Communists who must set an example in this regard.

Many proposals concern the demarcation of soviet power and party leadership, the improvement of the party apparatus' structure in this context, and the enhancement of soviets' role in regional development. Let us look at the question of holding report-back sessions and elections. The outcome of excessive orchestration is that the report and election campaign at grassroots party levels is conducted at the time when most people are on vacation, while on sovkhozes it

coincides with the peak period of agricultural work. In such conditions it is difficult to ensure high standards at party meetings or to achieve active participation by all Communists.

There is a pressing need for the CPSU Statutes to make provisions for measures to raise the standard of work by all elected party organs, and at primary level in the first place. I think that it would be expedient for the most authoritative, deserving, and respected people to be elected party organization secretaries in enterprises, institutions, and sovkhozes. A collective's leader, regardless of his official position and of how busy he may be, must find time for party work while the technical side could be delegated to a not-so-busy deputy paid from party budget funds. Moreover, here it is also necessary to create more independence for grassroots party organizations. It is necessary to abandon, once and for all, preset quotas in terms of age, service, sex, education, and so on which are, to put it mildly, recommended or, to be more accurate, imposed. An example of principledness in this regard must be set by the party Central Committee.

We discussed quite recently the problems of schools' restructuring. The schools' future leaves nobody indifferent. Even in my own brief lifetime the system has undergone so many reforms while still remaining a Cinderella. I think that our country today has an opportunity to channel sufficient funds to schools through the soviets so as to eliminate once and for all their humiliating position, having to always go hand in glove to their sponsors and base enterprises. The country's future must not be dependent on the moods of economic managers who are now constrained within the framework of economic accountability. (Applause)

Comrades! People sent us off to the conference with great hopes. I can say without exaggeration that people in all corners of the country are today listening to every word spoken from this rostrum. I propose that our resolutions more accurately set the Central Committee's political guidelines for Communists working in soviets, trade unions, and the Komsomol. It is necessary to immediately translate the political course into deeds, from which our cause of socialism can only gain. (Applause)

Saranskikh Address

PM0107205588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 8-9

[Speech by V.I. Saranskikh, first secretary of the Cherepovetskiy Gorkom, at 30 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Dear Comrades! The main issue now troubling all of us conference delegates is what we will take back with us and what kind of decisions we will adopt on the painful and urgent questions.

Communists and working people are awaiting answers to them, and we cannot, simply do not have the right, to disappoint these expectations. Without denying the positive aspects, it must be mentioned yet again that there is as yet no satisfaction being gleaned from these changes. On the contrary, a feeling of disquiet over the actual situation is growing. And there is reason for this.

The housing lists are not getting any shorter. Unsatisfied demand for many goods and services is growing. There is an essentially unchecked growth in prices. The ecological situation is becoming sharply aggravated. All this is giving rise to people's justified unhappiness and engendering many conflict situations.

We are tackling a number of problems locally, but regarding some issues we need to determine at the conference to what extent they are of statewide significance and affect the interests of each Soviet individual. The most important issue concerns the further democratization of our life. It has to be acknowledged that many obstructions have arisen to this, and this has justifiably been discussed in the report and the delegates' speeches. The policy proclaimed by the party of the development of work force self-management and its economic independence, as well as the State Enterprise (Association) Act, has essentially been blocked by the central authorities—from ministries through the Council of Ministers. Who will tell me, for example, why Moscow plans how much material a steelworker may consume in the smelting of steel? When will the planning of gross indicators involving a growth from the level that has been attained cease? What do we really wish to achieve? A sharp improvement in quality or a further deterioration therein and, essentially, the collapse of the economy and a raw material famine? Where may the work force council turn if it does not agree with an arbitrary ministry decision? Formulation of these questions is perfectly legitimate inasmuch as it needs to be borne in mind that while we are achieving a high rate of increase, much essentially unnecessary output, low-grade metal, poor combines and goods not in demand are being manufactured.

As a result, for example, Cherepovets' metal workers are producing over and above the plan tens of thousands of tons of rolled metal, but consumers' orders are being fulfilled monthly no more than 99.5 percent. This would not be permitted, I believe, by the self-managing outfit working on an economic accounting basis. But it is not as yet being allowed to be a zealous proprietor, and there is as yet no legal mechanism capable of protecting the work force against encroachments on its independence defined by law.

There is no need to repeat the thoughts which have been expressed in respect of the state order and profit deduction rules. An extremely abnormal situation has taken shape everywhere, and we are disturbed particularly by the fact that no changes are foreseen for next year, it would seem, and the ministry's plans are being drawn up

per the former scenario. As in Tagil and Karaganda, the load at the Cherepovets Foundry is once again exceeding available capacity, with the state order being set at 100 and more percent.

The working people are legitimately asking why the machinery of the ministries, which is manifestly swollen and impeding the former's work, is not being cut back quickly enough; the ministries have long been working for themselves, thinking up things for themselves to do and involving in this useless and frequently clearly harmful activity masses of people locally. It is also astonishing that many ministers, as members of the party Central Committee and deputies of the supreme soviets, are in no hurry to change anything in the activity of the bureaucratic offices under their jurisdiction and in the methods of leadership of the sectors.

The proposal concerning a halt to the practice of the obligatory election of ministers and a number of other executives to the highest party and state authorities would seem necessary and legitimate in this connection.

I support also Comrade Kabaidze's proposal concerning the withdrawal from ministries of the budget allowance and the introduction of payments to them from resources voluntarily allocated by the enterprises, which would evaluate these ministries' usefulness. (Applause)

Questions of personnel policy at the current stage of perestroyka were raised particularly trenchantly in the course of preparation for the conference. It is a question, comrades, of whether all leaders are capable in the positions which they occupy of ensuring the necessary dynamic work and whether all correspond in terms of their professional, political and even physical capabilities to the sharply increased demands. Far from all, I am sure. Many comrades remain devotees of the old administrative system and outdated command and pressure methods of leadership. Why persuade when you can order? And if for persuasion there is not the time, the desire, or even, at times, health, many people take this easy route. When it is possible to order, all of life's complexities are simplified to an elementary outline. But if the order is not fulfilled, a new one is written. And so on ad infinitum.

Such approximately is how the most prevalent braking mechanism appears, and it is as yet operating faultlessly in the party, soviet, and economic machinery. Many people as yet lack the civic and party courage to quit in time. Nor do the party committees frequently have enough of this courage. There are many such examples at all levels of leadership—from the very top to the local level. When compassion is shown a person who has served past his time, it is essentially the work which suffers. And it could truly suffer if many comrade executives, following the conference, once again set their watches to the proposed 10-year term. For this reason I support the proposal concerning limitation of the tenure of executive positions to two 5-year terms without any reservations and exceptions.

One further problem is worrying the Communists and all residents of our city, as it does all residents of the cities of Nizhniy Tagil and Karaganda. It concerns environmental protection. Its significance and seriousness are growing with every passing day, and the problem is increasingly acquiring a political dimension. At the same time one has the impression that the unpleasant events in a number of cities and regions of the country have not as yet taught anybody anything. The ministry occupies a very passive, indifferent position at times. Measures to improve the situation are worked up after great delay, and if the existing proposals are evaluated objectively, it has to be admitted that there are as yet no real grounds even for mild optimism. Academy science is remaining silent here as yet also.

The party committees of these cities and regions now find themselves in a difficult, dual position. On the one hand the raykom and gorkom secretary has to support the legitimate complaints of the public. On the other, we are the ones who have to respond to questions which have been raised, but doing so without direct respondents is very, very difficult.

Meanwhile, proposals are being submitted and decisions adopted pertaining to a further buildup in Cherepovets of the capacity of ferrous metallurgy and chemical industry with disregard for people's opinion and the current situation.

I support the proposal of the delegate from Nizhniy Tagil and believe that it is time for the USSR Council of Ministers to adopt a more clear-cut and definite position in this matter. It is time, finally, for the State Committee for Nature Conservation also to make its presence felt.

A few proposals pertaining to the restructuring of the party authorities. Party committees at all levels undoubtedly need to give up functions which are not their province, which, naturally, requires changes in their structure also. The obkoms and kraykoms need to be accorded the right to make these changes.

The primary party organizations—the main component, in which the success of perestroyka is being decided—merit special attention.

Control of the social composition, the multilevel nature of the examination of questions of party admittance and expulsion and the unwieldiness of the officialization of these matters are now out of date. It is no secret that many active supporters of perestroyka—middle-tier executives, specialists, teachers and others—remain for this reason outside of the party as yet. At the same time, on the other hand, there are many passive and incidental people in the party ranks. It is necessary to accord the primary organizations the right of final decisionmaking

in respect of the admittance, expulsion and punishment of Communists and afford them complete independence of choice of questions for discussion, periodicity and form of party meetings and of the planning of their work.

In the system of measures to intensify party influence, formulation of the status of primary party organization secretary merits special attention. How to ensure that he will be a real and not formal leader among Communists and in the work force? How to extricate him from dependence on the management executive? How to make this elective office prestigious in both moral and material respects? These questions are urgent, and the need for their solution is dictated by the new high demands on party work.

It is essential that the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department study all the proposals on this matter and prepare the appropriate documents as far as recommendations pertaining to a change in the party rules.

Comrades! Our party conference was preceded by truly nationwide discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses and the situation in the party and the country at the present stage of perestroyka. The whole period of Soviet power and the sources and consequences of the cult of personality and the periods of voluntarism and stagnation are being analyzed in detail. The delegates and all Communists, just as the majority of Soviet people do, have no doubt as to the need for such an analysis.

Many mistakes were made and outright crimes perpetrated against the party and the people, whose consequences were reflected so gravely in our social development and people's consciousness and mood. Dozens of years were let slip, and we do not have the right to drag out the solution of urgent problems and pander to the interests of individual social groups and officials, who, owing to sluggishness of thinking or personal reasons, are impeding the accelerated development of events. Doubly bitter feelings are evoked by the analysis of past years in us party workers, primarily because all crimes were perpetrated on behalf of the party.

However, Rashidov and his ilk should not be identified with tens of thousands of party workers of various levels, with those to whom the Communists have entrusted leadership of party committees and party organizations. It should not be forgotten that the transition to city- and rayon-level party work essentially means for the Communist an appreciable deterioration in his material position. However, the absolute majority of them perform their entrusted assignment honestly and responsibly. And it is not their fault but our general misfortune that worthless forms and methods have become implanted and firmly established in the party. I once again address this reproach to our press, the central press primarily. The mistakes made in leadership of the country and their negative refraction in the activity of the party committees locally undoubtedly weaken party influence in the masses. Therefore we do not need by inadequately considered publications and accusations of bureaucratic methods against all party authorities one after the other to make worse an already complex situation and sow mistrust among people as to the efficiency of party leadership. (Applause) Let us, comrades, together seek ways and methods of our speediest renovation. The main thing today is to speak less about the tasks and do more to accomplish them, displaying the maximum of party-mindedness and a constructive approach, comradeship, and responsibility. Only by deeds and actual results will we preserve the party's authority and restore among people complete trust therein.

I would like in conclusion to express the position of our Vologda delegation in connection with the proposals concerning an enhancement of the role of the soviets and an acceleration of the reform of the economy.

We support the proposal concerning the need for an improvement in the structure of the soviet authorities. At the same time, however, as practice shows, no structure will be of any use if it is not buttressed by an economic and legal mechanism and new procedure of formation of the local budget. To prevent just another camouflaging of the soviets' facade the problem needs to be solved comprehensively and in full. Concerning the election of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and of the obkom, gorkom, and raykom first secretary to the office of leader of the soviet, it would be correct to adopt this decision in combination with the economic and legal status of the soviets. At the same time, we would think it right to consult with the people on this question inasmuch as there are many different opinions both in the work force and in the party organizations.

I submit a proposal concerning the convening of the 28th party congress at the start of 1990. This would make it possible to formulate strategy for the next 5-year plan in good time and ensure its precise social orientation without losing a year, as has happened now, and without dragging out the changes which have to be made to the party rules.

The party conference and its decisions mark a more difficult and crucial stage of perestroyka. We delegates need to think today how to convey these decisions to the Communists and all working people, convey their spirit and content. It is important to make these documents not a subject for routine discussion but a practical action program. (Applause)

Zhivetyeva Address

PM0107185588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 9

[Speech by L.P. Zhivetyeva, livestock expert at Novosibirsk Oblast's "Pervomayskiy" State Breeding Unit named for the 60th Anniversary of the USSR, at 30 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrades! I find it very difficult to speak after orators in high office. I am just an ordinary working

woman. The Credentials Commission chairman calculated that there are 1,258 women at the conference, but since I am only the second one to speak I feel that this is another breach of democracy. (Laughter. Applause)

All working people in Novosibirsk Oblast fervently discussed the CPSU Central Committee Theses. We hope that this conference will give new impetus to the development of the spiritual, cultural, social, and economic life in our country.

Comrades! Having listened to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, I would like to say that it touched on many questions and even on the question of women. Women's labor occupies a major, a leading position in the countryside. For example, I have already worked for 25 years in the countryside, and all this time I have been a livestock expert. There were years when our breeding unit had an annual yield of 3,600 kg of milk. We had a shortage of cadres in Siberia, and then we had to ask ourselves: How are we rural working people going to cope in the future? It was not pleasant to be reproached for the shortage of foodstuffs, meat, and milk in the country. We had to take on a lot of work to fulfill the Food Program. Collective and lease contracts are helping us to solve the problems facing us.

Let me dwell on my own farm's example. Since we switched to lease contracts, our stock unit now has an annual yield of up to 6,000 kg of milk per cow. I would also like to say that our milk is inexpensive. Its prime cost is R16.74 per quintal. I think that all urban working people would eagerly buy our milk. (Applause)

Our team has only 15 members, but it produces about 15,000 quintals of milk per year. And if all rural working people were to lease livestock and premises and were to learn economic management the way economic management is being effected home in Siberia, I think that the successes would be obvious.

It is also necessary to bear in mind Siberia's hard conditions, with animals spending 9 months in stockyards and only 3 months in pastures when we can feed them on green feed. But it was the lease contract that taught us how to work. Now every team member is a proper steward, watching the money. While I was preparing to travel for the conference, our working people asked me to do them a great favor and deliver a series of remarks and proposals. Here, for example, is one of them. People in the countryside have now embarked on cooperative construction work. They are eagerly building their own apartments in rayon centers and in sovkhoz farm centers. But people in isolated villages are still sitting and biding their time because they do not know what future lies in store for their villages,.

I was strongly urged to draw attention to these isolated villages, so that the roads leading to them could be paved, so that kindergartens, clubs, and maybe even the simplest of sports facilities could be built in these population centers.

We believe that our apartments must be the same as in the cities—with running water, drainage, and hot water supply, that stores, and especially stores in isolated villages, ought to be supplied with all the necessary goods. The solution of these questions would help us retain young people in the countryside. After all, there is still a significant outflow of people from the countryside into the cities. I think that we will manage to fulfill the Food Program only if all these tasks are solved.

And here is another message that Siberia's working people asked me to convey to you, Mikhail Sergeyevich: That you should not abandon us in midstream [nac ne ostavili na polputi], that you should complete everything that has been started, and we will help you with restructuring. (Applause)

Uzbek Chief Nishanov Speech

LD3006192088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Speech by Rafik Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, at the 30 June session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] The report by Mikhail Sergeyevich points out absolutely correctly the deformations of the principles of socialism in the past. The people of Uzbekistan have themselves directly experienced the results of cruel diktat. The republican party organization is carrying out a difficult and uncompromising struggle for improving itself, for cleansing itself, for the rebirth of the Leninist spirit of internationalism in all spheres of life and labor. The most serious and tragic mistake was the agricultural policy. The single crop working had extremely serious consequences in the economy and in ecology. A whole sea found itself on the brink of disappearing: the Aral Sea, which quite recently was an all-union health resort, a base for the production of fish and fur. There were violations of crop rotations, misuse of chemical poisons, and thoughtless assimilation of ever more land. A whole mass of very acute problems came into being that require immediate and very rapid solution. They include the rational use of water resources, ecology, and issues concerning the education of cadres and putting industry onto the course of financial autonomy. Only concrete deeds will ensure the victory of revolutionary restructuring.

In his report, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev justly pointed out the fact that examples of stagnation continue in the development of Uzbekistan's agriculture. Indeed, a reduction in volumes of output of raw cotton, potatoes, fruit, grapes, ambari, and tobacco was allowed to take place in 1988. All sectors of the agro-industrial complex are virutally lame in both legs. Take, for example, cotton growing, the main industry in the republic's economy. The drive to build up the output of cotton at any price that was practiced in the past has had a particularly serious effect upon this industry and has thrown cotton

growing back to the level of the early seventies; and—this is the main thing—it has undermined the material interest and the prestige-content of the cotton producers' work.

Cotton growing as a matter of economic interest is now substantially behind other crops and the peasant finds himself faced with the choice of what it is now most to his advantage to engage in. We are now thinking about how we can raise the interest of people here, and of course we are not going to solve this task without help from the union planning and price-forming bodies, without intervention by the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee. On behalf of all cotton-growers who are delegates to this conference, we ask Comrade Murakhovskiy to look carefully at this question. [applause]

Quite naturally, during the restructuring and democratization of public life, there is also heated discussion of the issue of the right and the equal rights of nations in our country as a facet of relations between the nationalities, of strengthening the fraternal friendship of our peoples. Considerable attention is also being devoted to this question at our conference. In resolving relations between the nationalities which have been aggravated recently it is essential to be guided first and foremost by the supreme interests of the country. In this matter there is no place for narrow departmentalist, egoistical, and parochial onslaughts and attacks. Our people have a very meaningful word: khormang, which translated into Russian means tirelessly. And people use this word to support each other in the solution of great tasks and noble matters. So, khormang, dear comrade delegates, on the difficult path of restructuring.

Nishanov Speech Published

PM0107174188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 9

[Speech by R.N. Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, at the 30 June afternoon session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Dear Comrades! People are right to describe our conference as momentous. One can say that here, in this hall, we are deciding the major question of our time: Will socialism remain in the clutches of diktat and limited democracy, or will it acquire Leninist features in reality? The country has already made a major breakthrough on this path since April 1985. There have been many complexities and dramatic developments along the way. However, there have been lessons, too. The experience of restructuring shows that we must be bolder in demolishing everything old and obsolete. Only then can the new be built.

The CPSU Central Committee report delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is perfectly correct in pointing out the deformations of socialist principles in the past. The people of Uzbekistan have directly experienced the results of cruel diktat, unbridled lawlessness, and baseness during the years of Stalin's repressions. A deep moral wound was inflicted on them during the years of the triumphant march backward, when servility, perfidy, and deception allowed a leader and medal grabber like Rashidov to acquire 10 Orders of Lenin and 2 Gold Stars and, on top of that, to pick up a Lenin Prize. Who gave these orders to Rashidov? Brezhnev, of course, and his closest associates. Why did they award them? Simply because they themselves were medal grabbers. (Applause) That is why Communists and the people as a whole will never agree with those who, while giving the rule of law its due, do the same for lawlessness.

Relying on the initiative and support of the entire people, the 650,000-strong republic party organization is waging a hard and uncompromising struggle for self-improvement, self-purification, and the revival of the Leninist spirit of internationalism in every sphere of life and labor. However, there are also forces that offer resistance. They are insignificant, but they must not be underrated. It was Avicenna who said: "Beware of the fly that has sat on the serpent's carcass." The republic's people and Communists will not rest content until they have swept away all who managed to grab a little more than their share and continue to hold on to it. Our creative intelligentsia and party and labor veterans are active champions of restructuring. We meet with them frequently, consult them, and take part in heated debates. Their keen sense of knowledge and their rich experience of life are helping us find the best ways to solve the complex problems that have accumulated over the years. Dear comrades, we have many, many such problems.

The decades of fraud and data distortion in many sectors of industry and agriculture, especially in cotton production, had serious consequences. At the same time, they produced pain, suffering, and a low minimum standard of living for the ordinary working people, who were totally innocent of what was happening before their very eyes. The frauds and embezzlers are now receiving their just deserts. The atmosphere in the republic is being purified, and people are regaining their lost faith in truth and the triumph of justice.

Naturally, we will revert time and again to a critical and party-minded interpretation of the time of stagnation, the time of Rashidov's reign. However, it is already clear to us that the most serious and tragic mistake was the old agriculture policy. The monoculture policy had the most serious consequences for the economy and the environment alike. An entire sea was on the verge of extinction, that same Aral Sea which, until quite recently, was an all-union health resort, and a base for the fishing and fur industries. The Aral Sea, comrades, represents our anguish, the fruit of the merciless attitude toward it for decades on end. But not just the Aral Sea. Violations of crop rotation, overapplication of toxic chemicals, the mindless opening up of more and more new lands

without a strictly scientific approach and without accurate calculations—all this led to a situation whereby our most fertile soil ceased to be so, and dozens of diseases proliferated.

There is an entire group of our most urgent problems that demand immediate, most immediate solutions. They include the rational utilization of water resources, the ecology, cadre education issues, industry's transition to economic accountability [khozraschet], and the enlistment of the indigenous population in industry. There are countless problems. The main point, though, is that our people want to work and have a desire to keep up with the times.

The party is orienting the working people toward a serious and constructive approach to the work in hand. The party organization and our entire people realize with the utmost responsibility that specific deeds alone can ensure the victory of revolutionary restructuring.

We, comrades, have an ancient custom: to assemble for kurultay. That is when everyone meets for joint consultation. Our people's kurultay wholeheartedly supports restructuring. The cooperative movement and collective methods of contractual labor are spreading, and certain positive changes are taking place in the economy and the social sphere. However, imbalances in the economic structure and the use of the created potential have proved to be too deeply rooted.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev correctly pointed out in his report that stagnation phenomena persist in the development of Uzbekistan's agriculture. Indeed, we do suffer from serious mistakes and failures in the leadership of this sector. The output of raw cotton, potatoes, fruit, grapes, kenaf, and tobacco declined in 1987. In actual fact, every sector of the agro-industrial complex is in a sorry state.

Take the main sector of the republic's economy—cotton production, for example. The past pursuit of increased cotton production at any price had a particularly serious effect on that very sector, and it pushed cotton production back to the level of the early seventies. The main point is that the material interest and prestige of cotton growers' labor was undermined. From the point of view of material interest, cotton production is now substantially behind other crops, and peasants must choose: What would they be better off doing? Now we are thinking of ways to boost people's interest. Of course, we cannot resolve this task without help from union planning and price-formation organs, and without intervention from the USSR Gosagroprom. On behalf of all cotton growers attending this conference as delegates, we ask Vsevolod Serafimovich Murakhovskiy to carefully investigate this question. (Applause)

It is perfectly natural, comrades, that such an aspect of interethnic relations as the rights and equality of nations in our country and the strengthening of fraternal friendship between our peoples should be the topic of heated debate in the course of the restructuring and democratization of social life. Our conference is also devoting considerable attention to this question. The issue would seem to be clear. Hardly anyone would dare dispute the equal position of peoples in the USSR, but there are of course unresolved problems. After all, we are dealing with a very delicate area—national pride—and we must be cautious. We must determine if everything conforms to the truth.

This is the thought which comes to mind on reading the article published in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, whose author seems to be openly taking the republic to task on such matters as mutual assistance, cadre promotion, educational standards, proportion of postgraduate students in science, and even the birthrate. In the opinion of this article's author, the course of preferential development of the outlying national regions pursued by the party for several decades, an internationalist and humanitarian course, seems to have developed into some sort of contradiction and has created a situation of parasitism. One could legitimately ask: What sort of parasitism are we talking about? Yes, we realize that, thanks to the effective, long-term, and selfless assistance of the Russian and other peoples in the country, formerly backward republics, including Uzbekistan, are now equal in their economic and social development. We recall the years when Russia, hungry and cold at the time and literally down to its last piece of bread, helped the Central Asian republics not only with resources and equipment but also with specialists and with party and soviet cadres. But how can one criticize this assistance, which was a genuine manifestation of proletarian internationalism, the embodiment of Lenin's nationalities policy?

Such an ill-considered and, I would say, politically harmful approach to the affairs of the republic and the regions often produces a reaction like: "But we are clothing the whole country," "But we are feeding the entire state," and so on. The Soviet family, multinational and friendly, must be protected against such harmful attitudes. After all, this is one of the cornerstones of our internationalist policy. (Applause)

Every republic, comrades, has its special position in the country's unified national economic complex and makes its important contribution to our common cause, a contribution which no other republic could assume. This must be borne in mind at all times.

The Central Committee report substantiates in a comprehensive and well-argued manner the task of fully realizing the advantages of intraunion division and cooperation of labor, and of pursuing a scientifically substantiated regional policy. We fully and entirely support this proposition in the report. (Applause)

Our uneasy times indicate that the country's supreme interests must be the primary guide when resolving the recently aggravated questions of interethnic relations. In this work there is not, nor can there be, any room for tunnel vision, for departmental, selfish, or parochial impulses, or spur-of-the-moment actions. This is exactly how we are striving to act. A number of members of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Bureau met recently with leaders of Kazakhstan, Turkmenia, and Tajikistan. In a businesslike and comradely atmosphere, we discussed urgent questions of economic and cultural development and ideological education work, and we adopted decisions designed to eliminate the distortions and negative accretions of the past, as well as artificial barriers.

Both the report and the comrades' speeches at our conference very correctly emphasize that the utmost enhancement of the party's role and the strengthening of its positions are the guarantee of success in restructuring. The party is called upon to cleanse itself of everything alien, to free itself of economic activity that is not its proper function, to boost the functions of the soviets and social institutions, and to use political and organizational methods in the management of society and the economy. We fully approve and support the proposed reform of the political system. To rid state management of bureaucratism is not only something that affects the people as a whole; it is also a profoundly party matter. Now we all are convinced that bureaucratism is the main enemy of restructuring, but we also see growing signs of demagoguery concealed behind glasnost.

It has already been noted from this rostrum that labels are being attached and indiscriminate calls are circulating, going as far as the elimination of the party from leadership of the economy and its disbandment. I am convinced that this would be totally useless, just as the indiscriminate censuring of leaders and leadership bodies, especially party ones, is useless. Any labor, comrades, must be respected, be it that of a party functionary, journalist, writer, worker, kolkhoz member, or economic manager. Responsibility alone must be personal. The main thing is to work creatively, enterprisingly, wholeheartedly.

We are due to adopt a resolution on combating bureaucratism. This is very good, comrades. But, in our view, we would not be going amiss were we also to adopt—if not now then some time in the future—some sort of document on combating demagoguery. (Applause)

Now, when the country is in the process of healing itself, when democracy is spreading far and wide, we must radically improve the basic and further training of cadres, and of leadership cadres in particular. To me, it seems necessary to raise the ideological and intellectual level of our cadres, to teach them to engage in political work among the masses, and to participate freely in debates. This is very, very important now. It may be expedient to restore the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School for the basic training of party and soviet cadres capable of working in the new conditions, the conditions of restructuring. Should this be done, the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences would be able to concentrate totally on training the party's theoretical cadres. It would also become necessary to give profound consideration to the question of substantially improving the work of the USSR Academy of the National Economy.

After many years at work as a Soviet ambassador to a number of countries, I am convinced that the most profitable "commodity" for all firms and companies without exception is the investment of capital in training management cadres and specialists. Competence alone is the criterion applied abroad to the assessment of leaders in business life. And this is the main element of programs and courses for training leaders. We must develop and cultivate in economic leaders such qualities as merit and responsibility for the work in hand, a sense of innovation and the ability to take risks, and the capacity to keep up with the times. Briefly speaking, comrades, we must all learn democracy, we must learn political work, and we must learn to turn every kopeck into a ruble. After considering Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report to the conference, and hearing the sharp and frank speeches from the delegates, each of us is firmly convinced that the conference will give a new impetus to restructuring, and will open up an even broader path for society toward democratization and renewal. Our people have a meaningful word—"khormang"—which, translated into Russian, means "keep at it." People use this word to support each other when solving major tasks and accomplishing noble deeds. So, comrade delegates, keep at it along the difficult path of restructuring! (Applause)

IZVESTIYA's Laptev Speaks

PM0107135588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 9, 10

[Speech by I.D. Laptev, IZVESTIYA chief editor, at 30 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Kremlin Palace of Congresses; first paragraph is intervention by V.V. Shcherbitskiy headed "From the Transcript"]

[Text] V.V. Shcherbitskiy: Comrades! Before giving the floor to Comrade Laptev, there is a need to read out a note handed to the presidium by delegate Comrade Mamayev. In it he writes: "Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko is a man respected among the people and the party. His life and activity have been devoted to us. And we, the people, Communists, have placed another burden on his shoulders. For the umpteenth time the principle that 'he who does the work gets the blame' has operated. We have 'worn him to a frazzle.' And today Comrade Gromyko is lagging behind life. He has done his work, his noble deeds are remembered by the people. It would be wrong to insult a man unthinkingly. He is respected and loved among the people." (Applause)

[Laptev] Comrade Delegates! It would probably be no exaggeration to say that everyone sitting in this hall holds in their hands the fate of restructuring, and therefore the fate of the party and that of the country, in the most literal sense of the word. Whatever we discuss, whatever issues are raised from this platform, it is essentially a matter of two truly fateful questions: What is the party to be like and what is Soviet power to be like at the present stage of our society's development?

It is rather terrifying merely to raise those questions, let alone resolve them. But they have not merely been raised by Mikhail Sergeyevich in his report; they have been placed before us by life itself. Therefore, we will not be able to turn away from them and avoid resolving them even if we would greatly like to do so.

So what is the party to be like? Our party, which, after all that has happened, all it has endured, has tackled the majestic new cause of restructuring. In order to answer this question, so far as we can, let us try to look at it from the angle of any day's work by any first secretary at any level. Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov said a little about this yesterday.

Thus, if we take a look at a first secretary's work, we will see that this political leader is seen daily and hourly in many roles at the same time. He is a supply worker, a financier, an agronomist, a procurement worker, a psychotherapist, a construction worker, simultaneously a bureaucrat and a fighter against bureaucracy, a "jack of all trades," as the saying goes—it is hard to name a role he does not play in the course of the working day. You know this better than I do, because you constantly experience this, you have seen it thousands of times.

But, comrades, it is not merely a secretary who rushes around in his office, shares out resources, "extorts" reports, squeezes out plans, and monitors milk and crop yields. It is a representative of the party! We see this situation as a reflection writ large of the fact that the party in many respects has supplanted state, soviet, and other organizations and has assumed their functions. At the same time, it has taken on all the working people's complaints about these state, soviet, economic, social, and other organizations, allowing these organizations to hide calmly behind its back and to grow accustomed to not deciding anything themselves, and therefore bearing corresponding accountability, to grow used to a situation whereby they must wait for instructions on every point, as Comrade Kabaidze said yesterday, and, I would add, not merely instructions, but also to wait for a party worker or party organ to come along, take them by the hand, and lead them through the fulfillment of those instructions.

In our country the party concerns itself with everything—we customarily say that. But we forget to add: If it concerns itself with everything, then complaints about anything that anybody is unhappy or dissatisfied with will be addressed to the party. And today we have at last said: The party can no longer perform this universal, boundless role which no organization could ever perform. We have said that everyone must now do his own job and take responsibility for it. Responsibility not only before the raykom and the obkom, although that responsibility is great. He must answer before the people; there is no higher responsibility. That is why the party can now transfer the apparatus—and it is sizable—that it has created for direct management to soviet, economic, and state organs, since it is also transferring the relevant functions to them.

But what will the party be like under these conditions? I think that it is precisely the decisions that we are discussing today that will make it possible to return to the party its original role. The role that Lenin intended for it, the role for which he created it. It will become the genuine spiritual leader of society. It will become the political strategist, political mentor, and teacher of millions. It will regain its role as ideologist, in the best sense of the word. It will control the public consciousness, promote its development, and implement its directing and leading role via this consciousness. And this role will be far more authoritative, far higher and more influential than the one the party performs today. After all, it is precisely in the sphere of consciousness, in the sphere of convictions, that the most effective levers of social management and the most effective ways to the people's heart and the people's trust lie. We must place all our party work on this footing today. If we do this, the conference will be a truly historic milestone in the life of the party and the country. If we do not, it will be just another big meeting, and we will be unworthy of the trust of our party comrades who sent us here and of the millions of nonparty people who are pinning hopes on us.

What will Soviet power be like? I ask that question not because I know the answer to it, but because I want to take issue in no uncertain terms with the speakers who have expressed serious doubts as to the expediency of radically reconstructing the system of soviets and electing the first secretary of the relevant party committee to the post of soviet chairman. Doubts are always a good thing, of course, especially when there there are considerable grounds for them—there is the matter of the nonparty candidates for the post and the number of candidates. Yes, there will certainly be other questions too, and they cannot be simply rejected.

However, in my view, it is precisely here that the most promising opportunities open up for overcoming the peculiar dualism of power that took shape in our country back in the prewar times, established as a system the practice of party organs' supplanting of all other organs, and created an astonishing, unique situation: The person who makes the decisions bears no legal or material responsibility, and the person who bears that responsibility does not make the decisions.

Had Comrade Kunayev [former Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee first secretary] borne material and legal responsibility for his decisions, maybe he would not have dared to build himself the bathhouse worth R15 million that has already been mentioned here. If party leaders were not just verbally but in reality answerable to the law and the people, perhaps they would not have become chief architects, as we witnessed recently in a certain model communist city, and chief experts on art and even on soccer. So the combination of these two posts, no, not their combination, but their fusion together, will at last give us personal responsibility for the situation in each region, give us a master of the region who is accountable to the population and the public and has no opportunity to hide behind the back of the party committee.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this proposal for the whole cause of democratization. In my view, it is an outstanding proposal. Its ideological and political significance for the fate of our socialist motherland is tremendous, and I call on everyone present here to support it in every way and to instruct the party leadership to implement the decision from top to bottom and bottom to top. (Applause)

And here we must take into account, comrades, the fact that the role of the political superstructure in a socialist society is truly colossal. Nowhere else does the political superstructure play such a role as it does in our country. And it is decisively important to regulate the superstructure and to bring it into line with today's potential of life and our present tasks.

Now I want to touch on an issue that is quite risky so far as we journalists are concerned.

Our conference is greeting remarks about the mass media with hearty applause. This is not the first time such a situation has arisen. Many people here can remember plenums and conferences at which there was also lots of applause in this connection. This is a very interesting phenomenon. I want to thank all the comrades for the criticism of the newspapers, but what I want to say is this. Where does this phenomenon come from? Is glasnost an invention of journalists? Have we already learned the lesson in truth taught us by the 27th CPSU Congress? No. Glasnost is the party policy formulated and unanimously supported by the 27th congress. So it is the policy of every party committee. It is your tool for work, comrade party workers, it is your means of communication with the people and the popular masses' means of monitoring the activity of party committees and all organs of power. It is a gain of the people, a gain of our democracy, and a force that has to a great extent revived the people's belief in truth and social justice, raised their spirits, and strengthened to an unprecedented extent the people's trust in the party, as they demonstrated so powerfully during the preparations for our conference.

The great historian Karamzin, whose works today can at last be read by anyone who wants to, once said that the people's education is a state force. I think that this remark could be rephrased (which is something we still do with the classics) and put like this: "The people's mood is a state force." By telling the people the truth, showing them things that were previously concealed, and giving them the opportunity not just to have an opinion of their own but also to express it, the party and its mass media have tremendously increased this "state force of mood," interest, and activeness. And I don't think that anyone has spoken out against this.

So what is at issue? What is at issue, of course, is individual mistakes. Mistakes are unforgivable for us. I say this with total frankness not in order to satisfy or please someone. Our newspapers are read by tens of millions of people daily, and any inaccuracy, multiplied by those millions, deprives an editor of sleep, calm, rest, and sometimes also the right to occupy his post. And anyone who makes a mistake is strictly punished, we investigate how it originated, and we print corrections.

But there are different kinds of people among us too. (Noise in the hall) Different journalists, different editors. It is even said that there are different kinds of people among first secretaries. (Laughter) They are different everywhere. And journalists did not beam down from the heavens into the period of restructuring, they grew up among us. And they bear the same birthmarks that we all suffer. They relearn things, they restructure themselves, and like anyone, they are not insured against errors and blunders.

Moreover, let us be specific. Our press has many faces. We have newspapers that are published in a small print run and make blunders of their own. We have publications that run into tens of millions of copies. So it is hardly correct to speak generally and to put down to the entire press the errors and blunders of certain publications. A specific approach is a different matter. It has to be investigated without fail. We will not arrive at a unanimous opinion; there is the CPSU Central Committee, let us turn to it, but we will get to the truth without fail. We will get to it together! And in general, comrades, you and we, I want to stress this particularly, are carrying out the same job, albeit by different methods, but it is the same job—we are asserting glasnost and working for restructuring. And it is precisely on this path, I think, that we have an opportunity to work further, to work harmoniously.

One last point. I want to end my speech with the following. The conference is to adopt most important resolutions. If we go down the road of lauding, extolling, and rehashing these resolutions, as has often happened before, this will take a tremendous amount of time. Straight after the conference we must immediately begin to work in the spirit of these resolutions. I call on everyone to do this. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

Gorbachev on Procedural Issues

LD3006181188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Jun 88

During the conference Mikhail Sergeyevich twice requested the floor. He gave explanations on cardinal questions to be settled by the conference. They were requests by members of the commission for drafting a general political resolution.

At the beginning of the evening session, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev responded to a note conveyed to the Presidium. Listen:

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] During the speeches, many comrades have expressed the opinion that a special resolution needs to be adopted on youth. And here it is, evidently from Komsomol officials, first secretaries of oblast committees, and kray committees of the Central Committee of LKSMS [Lenin Communist Youth Leagues] of union republics. They propose and ask the conference to examine the question of the adoption of a resolution on youth by the end of the evening session. This proposal was made in speeches and delegates' notes to the Presidium.

In the commission for the first two questions, that is, on a general political resolution and on questions of democratization of the party and society, this question was debated on the initiative of Comrade Mironenko, taking into account what the delegates are saying. We have deemed it necessary this time to allocate a special point on this question, on youth, in our main general political resolution. It was the general opinion to state the fundamental ideas, which were expressed, in a separate point in the body of this general political resolution but in an extended form, taking into account the positions set forth both in the report and in the speeches, to advocate a strong social policy, a policy, not only a social policy, regarding youth, regarding the Komsomol. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1230 GMT on 30 June broadcasts a brief report on Gorbachev's remarks concerning the proposed resolution on youth, which notes that "a proposal was made to include in this resolution an expanded paragraph [rasshirennyy punkt] devoted to young people."] The Komsomol members will be content. Later there will be a plenum and so on. [murmuring in the hall] That's the spirit. Perhaps one might even come out in favor of holding a plenum so that it can have a continuation, so to speak. How about it, comrades? [murmuring in the hall] As part of the general resolution? [sounds of agreement in the hall] Are there no other opinions? [sounds of "no" from the hall] Good.

And one more issue: Comrades are anxious as to what is going to happen as far as the debate is concerned, and I understand. Two hundred and sixty-one people have put their names down now, and that's good. We decided to have an exchange on this in the commission as well. Our commission is enormous. All the delegations are represented there, and that's why we decided what should be done. Some comrades say that perhaps one session should be held in sections, that some kind of groups should be organized. We started to think this through. You know, the conference immediately breaks up and goes off into private groups. This is seemingly quite tempting: sit everyone down in the halls—and there's no shortage of those—and everyone could have their say, but many people wouldn't hear. Even perhaps a general plenary session is precisely... [Gorbachev changes thought] Well, in the first place, it puts discussing problems on another level and presents more conditions under which it is possible to talk about the main thing, what really is most essential, what should be heard by the conference, and not just everything that could find a way to solving these problems in another form. However, there is such a proposal—that a session should, perhaps, be held in groups and sections.

Let us define our position, comrades. [murmur from the hall] Does anyone insist? [general "no" from the hall] No. Well, those who asked or wrote a note about it have got their answer, I think. Even so, we will ensure collectively here, and are doing so, that the debates are representative.

When we began to operate, we did not issue any tasks to commissions on drafting speeches; but, obviously, it will be necessary to regulate, comrades, in order that, to start with, the whole of our party is represented and second, no doubt, some areas of our life. Otherwise, nothing gets done. However, I think we should continue to stress that there should be more people from the working class, the peasantry, and the scientific and technological intelligentsia making speeches. Is that not so? [applause] And we will, so to speak, keep an eye on this. Then we will be moving forward.

Next, and finally, Comrade Baklanov voiced the opinion—a commission voiced the opinion—to support and convey this address from the commission. Well, it's just a commission, and it's the opinion, not the commission, that's important—that of asking the delegates scheduled to speak later to try and restrict themselves to 10 minutes. [loud applause] But the rule stays—15. [laughter] However, we are asking all those who are to speak, I think, to heed this. Then there may be a chance for even more people to speak. Pardon?

[Unidentified voices from the floor] The Presidium ought to stop them.

[Gorbachev] Alright. Nevertheless, we will act with respect for one another. It is a great skill, learning to hear another person out; oh, it's a great skill. And of course, speakers should, above all, stick to the essence, but not all of us can. We're learning, and no doubt it'll get better and better. We'll get more experience and better standards and everything here. We'll move ahead. [end recording]

Fedorov Urges Emphasis on Individual

LD3006221988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1415 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Speech by Svyatoslav Nikolayevich Fedorov, surgeon, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 30 June—recorded; broadcast in progress]

[Text] ...in the physical sense. We are now at our conference in order to rid ourselves of political shortsightedness or of political stigmatism. But there also exists just normal human shortsightedness. And for that it is necessary to have instruments of production that should belong to us. Ivan Vasiliyev put it beautifully, marvelously, when he said that, if the instruments of production do not belong to the working class or the peasantry, then they will have a production shortfall of some 15-20 percent. When I recently read through all the works of Karl Marx, Engels, and our own classics, so to speak, I was delighted to see that—look—it turns out that in 1881 Karl Marx said: The worker is only free when he is the owner of his own means of production. And so on, and so forth. In other words, how can man depend, that is, not have instruments of production? And someone is in charge. Our enormous ruling and administrative system has taken on such a huge weight—even for how a shirt should be cleaned or washed there's a minister on the subject. It's a nightmare! What's the point when any women can do it, and any, as it were, small workshop can repair everything, and so on.

So, if... [Fedorov changes thought] What's going on in our institute? Reduction of the official rate of pay has led to some good doctors being able, at last, to have a normal life: to earn R600-700 [per month] and, as it were, to feed their children normally, to develop, as it were, culturally, and to advance still further, to work better. And they will most certainly work better. We are setting ourselves the task, in 2-3 years, of increasing productivity... [Fedorov changes thought] We have increased labor productivity by 300 percent. We are setting the task of increasing it by a further 100-150 percent. It seems that there is no need to churn out new doctors or to make new clinics, and that in that huge center we shall, in time, in about 5 years, have reached a level of some 500,000 operations. That will be half of the people requiring operations in the Soviet Union, and the work will be performed by just 400-450 doctors. At the moment, the task cannot be accomplished with 5,000.

What huge reserves there are! We worked out that, apparently, every ruble invested in a doctor's salary gives me, as an administrator and representative of the state, R3.50. Marvelous! You realize? For this, a person gives 3 and ½ times more work, so long as we invest in him, the person. It turns out that the main investment should be not in expanding production centers, but in man. At long last, we should believe in our man. At long last, we should stop talking about the human factor, and talk instead about the human individual, about the harmonious development of that individual. After all, that is the main aim of the revolution and the development of socialism—the individual, who would be more developed and superior in his ideology.

And, of course, this must be dealt with by the party, which is today drowning in matters of economic management: to give or not to give, how much, and so on and so forth—signing endless scraps of paper. We can work that out for ourselves. We have now made a decision at our institute; we simply made a request—and many thanks to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov for allowing us to lease the whole institute for a cost of 20 million. We pay out of our own pocket R520, and the 600,000 which we collect we hand over to the Ministry of Health for them to build children's hospitals and buy some sort of new and, so to speak, interesting and necessary equipment.

We shall hand over, out of our profits, this 3 percent of our fixed assets. But at the end of the year we shall divide up all our profits and include them in our shared staff participation fund, and each person, both the cleaning woman and Professor Fedorov, will receive either R1,000 or R1,500. This is how we shall do it and work it out: If we work well and spend our money sensibly, we shall grow rich; but if we work badly, we shall become paupers.

In order for this system, so to speak, of lease contracting—contracting in agriculture, so to speak, and leasing, so to speak, and so on—to start spinning—well, I'm surprised Viktor Nikolayevich [as heard] came and asked: Have any of the union ministers been here to see it, and so on? And I said: No, they haven't. To be sure, Yevgeniy Ivanovich [Chazov] recently sent all the ministers—they all took a look and all said. Ooh, ah; nothing of that will work in our area. Why? We don't have any leaders, they said. Come off it! Has a great people, which [word indistinct] all leaders—has it [words indistinct] or what? What's it all about? Where have the leaders gone? Is it that we no longer have any brains, so to speak? That we haven't any normal people? That the party is incapable of growing leaders? It must deal with this. If there aren't any of them, then that's disgraceful. After all, they are the foundation of society—people, honest professionals, who are able to manage both production and science, and so on.

Therefore, I think that it was Comrade Bondarev who said here that we have taken off but don't know where to land. I believe that perhaps he doesn't know where to land—he's a writer—but I do know, for example. I know that we shall land in an excellent society [applause]. We shall develop our country and shall lift people up for work, so to speak—we shall give good treatment; we shall work splendidly; we shall look after our country, we shall concern ourselves with ecology and whatever we like. Our goals are clear, and we must land our aircraft on a grand airfield. It has made headway.

Undoubtedly, without democracy, without the word of the people, without control by the people, and without people's power, our state cannot exist. Sixty years of management by administrative methods have shown that we can only advance forward through economic methods, through giving people an interest, and only through precise—just, so to speak—payment for labor. Therefore, elections from the bottom upwards! Without a doubt, I am in favor of work for 5 years, or a maximum of 10 years, and no exceptions of any kind beyond that. People must be changed, and young people must come in, with new ideas. Although experienced cadres can give advice; nobody will reject their advice, so to speak. But it is healthy people, with adrenalin, a good adrenal system, who can work actively in our society.

It is, of course, impossible to live without glasnost. Who indeed will live mutely? We are already living, so to speak, mutely and so intimidated by Stalinist methods, so to speak, and by others, so to speak. We are fearful of everything. This is the greatest ill—this fear of the people to speak the truth to themselves, to a higher-ranking comrade, so to speak, and to those alongside. We shall be lost without glasnost.

But glasnost, of course—as Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev] has rightly stated—has created a sharp sword, and of late I have observed myself that criminal responsibility should be taken for the lies in the press, and it should not, so to speak, be so simple for a newspaper to reduce an individual to ashes. Recently I read a letter that a deputy chairman of the Karelian Council of Ministers wrote to a local party committee secretary or to someone in Pechora in connection with the fact that SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA had written that there is some bad man there somewhere who all but—oh, giving some kind of nebulous explanations—and that Turmanov should be removed from his work and elections be reheld. [sentence as heard] Without checking anything and without knowing anything—whether he is a swindler or whether he is an honest person—he should be removed from his work just because the newspaper said so. Well, this is some kind of nonsense. Where here is the legal state? There is not even a whiff of law in this case. Therefore, I consider that, if an individual is really denigrated in the newspapers—and it is possible, you know, to denigrate a person in such a way that he will spend his whole life trying to vindicate himself—then the person who wrote it should be taken to court or, so to speak, have to be fully answerable for it.

Now for intellectual property. I was recently at a meeting of the Council of Ministers, where we were deciding a strange issue; namely, does the thinking of an individual belong to that person or does it belong to the state. Somehow I had never pondered on that previously, and was simply stunned when it turned out that many comrades from the State Planning Committee were trying to prove that all of my ideas belong to the state, and not to myself, and that they may be sold without it concerning me, I am simply given a certificate of authorship, and so on. They would say that once the idea arises at work and in a state post, it means that the idea belongs there. I would say: What if the idea came to me at night. [applause] Damn it, what kind of development of the individual is this?

So I consider that one needs precisely an orientation on the individual. You have heard too few reports about the individual here. Why are obkom secretaries not saying how many people have become happy over the 5-year period? I indeed am not stirred by the fact that 16 percent of the cows there have begun to produce more milk. I am concerned with how many people have begun to live better and more happily. That is to say that this is the way to appraise our system of government; namely, the level of happiness of people. [applause]

Fedorov on 'Accountability'

PM0407142988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by S.N. Fedorov, general director of the "Microsurgery of the Eye" intersectorial scientific and technical complex, at the 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union Party Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates, we have already listened with satisfaction to many speeches here, and many thoughts crop up. But the main thought which disturbs me concerns our revolution. I have been thinking about why it was carried out and whether we have come close to fulfilling the tasks set by the Great October Socialist Revolution. The revolution, after all, set a prime goal: the goal of justice in the distribution of the wealth created by the people, and the absence of exploitation of man by man. If it is fairly distributed, then fine, that means people have an incentive to work, that there is initiative, and that the people own the wealth. With fair distribution, labor productivity should grow quickly and be higher than in countries where the working man is exploited and where his labor is not assessed fairly.

Unfortunately, wage rates established back in 1931 have been accorded pride of place in our economy. A wage rate is contrary to the principle of fair distribution according to labor. Whether you work well or badly, it is virtually the same. And none of us knows what he is worth. I only learned what I was worth when I went over to real economic accountability. I sometimes find it strange, therefore, to listen to our economists here, who are constantly seeking out fantastic new methods to bring about fair distribution and increase labor productivity. Speakers from this rostrum have cited the following figures: Instead of 16,000 tonnes, you get 76,000 tonnes through economically accountable self-recoupment. Comrade Kabaidze has also, most likely, increased labor productivity fivefold and is solving all the social questions. I recently listened to Director Chabanov, who

said that they intend, through self-recoupment and economic accountability, to do a lot of good work in this 5-year plan, to increase labor productivity by a factor of 12, and to raise the average wage to R1,500 a month. He says this calmly and confidently. And I believe him absolutely. Why? Because I, too, work on the basis of self-recoupment, economic accountability, and self-financing. We know that when a product made by us has 3, 5, or 10 percent of your labor and the the labor collective fairly distributes its labor, labor productivity grows apace. When I was asked at the party raykom whether we would meet the target of 100,000 operations this year (we started with 24,000), I replied: Tell me what you can do to prevent me overfulfilling the plan? If I overfulfill it, will you expel me from the party or issue a strict reprimand?

The party Central Committee and the Council of Ministers have given us the right of full economic accountability, self-recoupment, access to the Western market, and have ceased constantly monitoring and "shepherding" us, and they now believe that the people are industrious and clever and will not steal from themselves if they know that they are working for themselves and are paying a reasonable share to the development of the social sphere, the development of roads, and so forth.

We are all still living on the basis of requisitioning farm produce [prodrazverstka], having abolished the food tax in 1928 or 1929, when no matter what you do, you end up with a minimum of some sort. Therefore, the transition from the "requisitioning of farm produce" to the "food tax," which is now being carried out by the party, again goes back to Lenin, to the idea of "more socialism"—and this process is encountering colossal difficulties, because the political superstructure was created by Stalin to the accompaniment of the "requisitioning of farm produce"—virtually, I would say, to the accompaniment of Trotskiy's ideas that one can make hired and forced labor more productive than free labor by means of control and harsh treatment. We continue to this day to live according to these ideas. We drove out Trotskiy, but, for some reason, his ideas, which were exploited by Stalin, have long lingered on. We must therefore switch over more rapidly to the ideas of Lenin about which the party Central Committee has spoken today—the fair distribution of the results of labor, when everyone will know what he has done and what percentage of it is his.

Our lives have now changed at the intersectorial scientific and technical complex. First, we have two plants, enormous clinics, and the state spends R120 million on us. We will carry out 300,000 operations in 2 years, which will eliminate the backlog in the treatment of eye diseases.

We are now ridding ourselves at our conference of political shortsightedness or political astigmatism. But, in addition to this, there also exists ordinary human shortsightedness. To cure it we need the implements of production, which should be ours. Ivan Vasilyev put it excellently when he said that if the implements of production do not belong to the working class or peasantry, then the return from them will be only 15-20 percent. And when I was recently rereading the works of the classic Marxist-Leninists, I saw with satisfaction that in 1881, as it transpired, Karl Marx said: The worker is free only when he is the owner of his own means of production. Our enormous administrative system has assumed an great burden, even for cleaning or laundering a shirt there is a minister. Who needs this? Any woman can do this and any small workshop can do repairs for us.

What is happening in our institute? The abandonment of the wage rate has made it possible for some good doctors to earn R600-700 and, so to speak, feed their children properly, develop culturally, and endeavor to work even better in the future.

We have now increased labor productivity by 300 percent and are setting ourselves the goal of increasing it another 100-150 percent. Then we will not have to train new doctors and build new clinics. In our center, with time, in 5 years, we will reach the figure of around 500,000 operations, half of those required in the Soviet Union. There will be just 400-450 doctors working altogether. At present 5,000 of them are unable to handle the task. These constitute enormous reserves. We have calculated that each ruble invested in a doctor's salary produces for me, as the administrator, as the representative of the state, R3.5. Thus main investment should go into people rather than expanding production. We must at long last trust people, stop talking about the human factor and talk about the individual and the development, the harmonious development, of that individual. That, after all, is the main goal of the revolution and socialism.

An individual who would be more developed and elevated in his ideology. And this must, of course, be done by the party, which is presently immersed in questions of economic management—to give or not to give, how much, and so forth. We can come to grips with this ourselves. We have asked Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov to permit us to lease the whole institute at a cost of R20 million.

We pay R520 out of our own pocket. We collect R600,000 and give it to the Ministry of Health to build children's hospitals and purchase necessary equipment. We will hand over the 3 percent of fixed capital from our own revenue and at the end of the year we will divide the whole of our revenue and pay it into the share participation fund. And everyone—both nurse and professor—will receive R1,000 or R1,500 depending on how we work. If we work well and spend our money sensibly, we will become rich; if we work badly, we will become poor.

It would not be a bad idea to introduce the lease contract system, the contract operating in agriculture, into other sectors. I am surprised when Comrade Ryzhkov asks

whether anyone from the union republic ministries has familiarized himself with the experience of our intersectorial complex. My answer is no, there has been no one. True, Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov recently sent union republic health ministers to us. They had a look round, heaved a sigh, and pronounced—it wouldn't work for us. Why? Because, they said, we do not have any leaders. Come now, a great people all of whose leaders have been wiped out. What's up? Where have all the leaders gone? What? The party can't foster leaders? It should be the party's job, after all. If there are none, it's scandalous. Leaders are the foundation of society. We have honest people, professionals, who can manage both production and science.

Therefore, when Comrade Bondarev said that we have taken off and do not know where to land, he perhaps does not know where to land. He is a writer. But I, for instance, do know. I know that we will land in a developed society (Applause), we will develop our country in the necessary direction, we will inspire people to work. We will carry out good treatment, do first-class work, take good care of our country, and look after the environment and so forth. Our aims are clear. And we must land our plane on a first-rate airfield. We must make progress. (Applause)

As for democracy and glasnost, it is undeniable that without democracy, without the word of the people, without monitoring by the people, without rule by the people, our state cannot exist. The period of management by administrative methods showed that we can make progress only by economic methods, by people having an interest, and by well-defined labor remuneration. Therefore, we need elections from top to bottom. It goes without saying that I am in favor of elected officials working for 5 years, with a maximum of 10 years, without any exceptions. People must be changed, young people with new ideas must come in. Experienced cadres can offer advice, no one will reject it, but only healthy people with a good adrenal system can work energetically in our society.

Glasnost. It is impossible to live without it, of course. Who, then, is going to live without glasnost? We have already lived so long without it, been so frightened by Stalin's methods and other fears; we fear everything. That is the greatest misfortune, the people's fear to tell themselves or a superior comrade the truth. And without glasnost we will be lost. But glasnost is, as Mikhail Sergeyevich rightly says, a double-edged sword. Criminal responsibility must be accepted for lies in the newspapers. And just saying sorry won't do. After all, a newspaper can destroy someone. I recently read a letter from the deputy chairman of the Karelian Council of Ministers, who wrote to the party committee secretary or someone in the "Pechor" Artel as follows: "In view of the fact that the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA has written that the chairman of the cooperative there, Turmanov, is bad, he must be dismissed and reelections held." Without checking anything and ignorant of whether he was a crook or an honest man. People should not be dismissed from their jobs on a newspaper's say-so. Where is the legal state here? There is not a whiff of the law. I consider, therefore, that if indeed someone is defamed in the newspapers, and it is possible to be so defamed that you will never live it down, the person who wrote it must be committed for trial and be held fully accountable.

Now for intellectual property. I was recently at a session of the Council of Ministers where we tackled the strange question of whether an idea belongs to the individual or the state. I had for some reason never thought about this before and was simply startled to hear that many comrades in the Gosplan were trying to prove that all my ideas belong to the state rather than me. (Laughter) They can sell them and I don't come into it. I am issued with an inventor's certificate and that's that. And I am told that if an idea is generated at work, while one is sitting on a state chair, that means it belongs to the state. To which I say, and if the idea comes to me during the night, what then? (Applause) What sort of development of the individual is this? I think we must use man as our compass bearing. We have heard little about man in the reports here; why don't obkom secretaries tell us how many people in their oblast have become happy in the last 5 years. I am not concerned that cows are producing 16 percent more milk there. I want to know how many people are now living better lives and have become happy. How happy people are is the main gauge of our system. (Applause)

TV Camera Complaint Cited

LD0107110288 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; "announcement" by V.I. Vorotnikov at the 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Text] Comrades, I will read to you this note which has been delivered to the presidium: For the 3d day in a row, television is using the same camera position and is showing the same delegates without paying attention.... [interrupted by laughter and applause] Please allow me to finish—without paying attention to the gallery. We request that the television pay attention to the gallery. [laughter]

Delegate Defends Gromyko

LD3006190488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Statement by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference—recorded; although radio announcer mistakenly identifies speaker as V.I. Vorotnikov, a 1700 GMT "Vremya" television report clearly shows Shcherbitskiy reading the statement]

[Text] It is necessary to make public a note to the Presidium from delegate Comrade Mamayev. He asks that it be read.

In the note he writes: Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko is a respected man of the people and party. His life's work is devoted to us. We, the people, Communists, however, have placed another burden on his shoulders. The principle that the one who bears a burden is given more has come into effect again. We have worn him out with work. Today Comrade Gromyko has grown tired of life. He has done his work, his noble deeds are in the people's memory, and we should not treat a man so badly. He is respected and loved by the people. [applause]

Peace Committee Chairman Borovik

LD3006211188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Speech by G.A. Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, at the 30 June evening session of the 19th CPSU All-Union Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Text] We have been talking a great deal about patriotism recently. This is a good thing, but one is disturbed by the insistent appeal for national patriotism: You Kazakhs develop your own patriotism and we Moldavians will develop our own; you Georgians have yours and we Russians ours—you have your values and we have ours.

Let's treat each other with respect. This is the best kind of program. But respect between peoples is merely the very first, the very lowest rung in civilized relations—an essential one, but the very first. This kind of appeal could be made, and probably has been made more than once, by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to Ronald Reagan. But it is not quite enough to pose respect as the maximum program in relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Incidentally, you will not find the words Soviet patriotism in this type of statement. What would have happened during the Great Patriotic War if our peoples had merely respected one another? What can we resolve in our country today without a merging of interests, without fraternity and a willingness to defend one another in any misfortune? The words Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism are somehow falling into disuse; and I am very pleased that today they have been said here with great enthusiasm.

But of course, it is not a question of words. The process of the alienation between nationalities is very dangerous—this is mine, that is yours; it is up to Russian patriots to save Yasnaya Polyana, and up to Armenian patriots to preserve the khachkar crosses. No. These things are the duty of every civilized person—each and every one. I propose that when we are restoring historical monuments of any nation we should dispatch an internationalsit team of workers, an internationalist team of restorers. It should be our common, Soviet heritage. Imagine somebody shouting at Pushkin that he has no business writing Russian poetry because he has a dark complexion and his hair curls like a foreigner's. Yet the idea that Gogol secretly despised Russia and loved Poland on the sly, because he was descended from the Janowskis, has actually been published in our country!

You will probably say that this was a mistake by the editor or the writer. But from our experience of events in Armenia and Azerbaijan, we know the fateful role which some representatives of the intelligentsia—historians and writers—are capable of playing if they consider their main task to be the aggrandizement of one people at the expense of another, or at the expense of the interests of our entire motherland. Surely we have suffered enough from the suspiciousness of the thirties to prevent us from seeking foes among brothers and declaring entire nations counterrevolutionary today. One can recall how Kazakh women drove their livestock into the newly liberated Ukraine in 1944 to feed their Ukrainian brothers; and one can recall how soldiers of all nationalities wept and embraced on encircling Von Paulus' army [in the battle of Stalingrad], how they built Bratsk and opened up the virgin lands. By the way, the tragic years of the war in Afghanistan were, for our soldiers, fulfillment of their internationalist duty, whatever our view of the war itself may be.

All this is our biography, our common biography; and the whole truth has to be told about it, but without gloating over the misfortunes of others. I repeat that this is our biography, and we are answerable for it.

It is essential to seek a mechanism which would rule out any possibility of the people receiving disinformation or incomplete information about the situation in the country. The petty short-term benefits which we obtained by failing to give timely reports on Chernobyl, the shooting-down of the South Korean aircraft, and the events in Nagorno-Karabakh subsequently cost us irreparable loss. The more truth there is, the greater belief. This is very true.

Glasnost is helping us to derive lessons from our own history, including the history of our propaganda. What I mean here is our extraordinary penchant for hysterics: We heaped hysterical praise on corn [reference to Khrushchev's campaign to promote corn cultivation] and then just as hysterically cursed it; we hysterically abused architectural excesses and then just as energetically cursed faceless buildings. We are either hysterically praising or else hysterically cursing something. Let's try to work things out calmly: Where in our history there is a grave tragedy for the people, where there is great heroism, and where there is simply farce.

Let us learn from this. It seems to me that hysteria and hatred are harmful to restructuring; these are not restructuring's state of mind, nor its emotions. And it is not just these things that are harmful, but also incompetence, stupidity, and blind faith. Faith must be founded on exact knowledge and only on exact knowledge.

A French Communist worker recently told an activist of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace that what is now happening in our country has once again given him the right to be proud that he is a Communist. I do not regard the view of a French Communist as decisive for us, but, nonetheless, it is very nice to hear such words about one's motherland.

Discusses Khrushchev, Brezhnev

LD0107110888 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report on speech by G.A. Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, at 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Moscow]

[Text] Genrikh Aviezerovich Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee, spoke of the need to inculcate in Soviet society feelings of comradeship and patriotism. It has been worrying, he stated, to hear the calls that have been made recently to the patriotism of individual nationalities.

[Begin Borovik recording] I have read somewhere the phrase that the Soviet people are an invention of Brezhnev. But the Soviet people are not an invention of either Brezhnev or anyone else. They are, fortunately, a reality. And it will be a great crime if we allow this concept to be eroded and to lose respect for it. We have a law which forbids the insulting of national dignity. If we want a state based on the rule of law, we must make use of this law now.

We need a law providing for exactness of information. We people who were deprived of genuine statistical data believed Khrushchev when he announced that communism would arrive by 1980. I would not like to think that he was trying to deceive people, but if he believed it, that means he did not have reliable information. In the 1970's we were told that we were living in the epoch of developed socialism. Many people laughed at this but it aroused hope in their hearts. Perhaps in some parts of the country something had been done to make it possible to say that. But Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report contains the phrase that we did not know the depth of the neglect of the economy. That means that even the Politburo did not have true information. That is the extremely dangerous situation which brought us to the brink of tragedy.

It is essential to seek out a mechanism which would exclude any possibility of the people receiving disinformation or incomplete information about the situation in the country. The more truth there is, the more trust. That is very true. You know, Fedorov told me that he had invited blind people to come to his clinic for a check-up. He is sure that 15 or 20 percent would regain their sight. And you know, they refused. They had grown accustomed to living on various benefits. They did not want to come. This is a tragic flaw but, unfortunately, it is a fact. Glasnost helps us to draw lessons from our own history, including the history of our propaganda. [end recording]

Attacks Nationalism

PM0407110188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by G.A. Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, at 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] I had prepared a quite different speech. I wanted to talk about the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and the people's diplomacy, but the course of the debates has convinced me that there is no point in that. If people are unaware of the restructuring going on in the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace or of people's diplomacy, then it will not be possible to describe it in brief terms, and if they are aware of them, then there is no need to talk about it. This morning I wrote a brand new speech, and if some of it isn't quite right, then you will not hold that against me. and even though my friend Fedorov judiciously "borrowed" something from my speech, I will nevertheless not change it.

Picture the scene: An aircraft is standing in a field. It is an ordinary aircraft; it has all the usual things in it. It has portholes, seats, and a gangway and the passengers are seated there. Everything is as it should be. Only suddenly you discover that this is not a field at all that the plane is standing in but a swamp. A dangerous swamp that sucks you down. A little further—and you perish. The crew assembled all the passengers to discuss what to do. Everyone agreed: They must take off if they can.

With a great and incredible effort the pilots lifted the plane above the swamp and above the trees. Its flight characteristics were poor. A lot of rust had begun to form and lumps of mud clung to it. It was hard work but it was flying. Suddenly one of the passengers asks: "What is this? The aircraft has taken off but you do not know where you are going?" Another says: "You have taken away our faith. We thought that we were in a field but it turned out to be a swamp."

But the plane had taken off! It had taken off all the same! And our faith is in it.

For the moment we are still circling over the swamp, it seems. But not for much longer—the fuel will not last. You can't go back either—that way lies destruction.

We are all the crew of our aircraft.

Of course, the comparison of the motherland with the aircraft is a weak one, the motherland is our Soviet land, we have airports here, we have beacons, and as Vysotskiy sang: "Paris is open but I do not need to go there."

But if we pursue the aircraft metaphor—it was used for the first time yesterday—then most of all we need truth: The truth about how much fuel there is, how the control surfaces are operating, and so on and so forth. We need history—the distant and recent past—why did we end up in the swamp? In my view that is exactly what we are here to find out. That is what glasnost is all about.

We need a route. That is also what we are doing here. Everyone together, not in words but in deeds. This is first time it has been that way, in my view. And we are planning the route together. That is democracy.

The most difficult thing is this: We need to restructure the plane in midair, we have to make it the best there is so that in the future it does not have to refuel at foreign refueling stations. This is what radical economic reform means.

We still need unity, not the unity expressed on banners, the ostentatious unity, but a unity that stems from the mind and the heart. And I want to talk about this in particular.

We have been talking about patriotism very often recently. That is good. But the insistent appeal to patriotism, one-nation patriotism as it were, from some cultural figures is alarming: You Kazakhs, develop your own patriotism, we Moldavians develop ours. The same goes for you Georgians, us Russians; you have your values, we have ours. Let us respect one another. That is the program.

But the peoples' respect for one another is only the first and the lowest level of civilized relations. A necessary step, but only the first. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has made that appeal repeatedly to Ronald Reagan, the President of the country whose nuclear missiles are aimed at us.

But it is not enough to propose respect as the maximum agenda in relations among the peoples of the Soviet Union, as has been done in some newspapers. Incidentally, you won't find the words "Soviet patriotism" in those articles. What would have happened during the Great Patriotic War if our peoples had merely respected one another? And what can we resolve in our country today unless there is a fusion of interests and unless there is fraternity and the readiness to defend each other through thick and thin?

But the words "Soviet patriotism" and "socialist internationalism" seem to be falling into disuse. I am very glad that they have been expressed here today and with great force. But of course, it is not a matter of words. The process of the disuniting of the nations is very dangerous. This is my business, that is yours it is claimed. It is up to Russian patriots to save Yasnaya Polyana and then up to the Armenians to preserve the khachkars (ancient stone crosses). Yet surely this is the duty of every cultured man. Every single one!

I propose that when we restore the cultural monuments of any nation we should send international teams of construction workers and international teams of restorers there. Let this be our common Soviet achievement.

Imagine a man shouting at Pushkin who has no right to be counted a Russian poet because his skin is somewhat dusky and his hair is curly, unlike ours. Yet in our country they publish the view that Gogol secretly hated Russia and that he had a sly love for Poland because he was "one of the Yanovskiy family" [reference to Gogol's forebears]. You will say that this is the mistake of the editor who published it and the mistake of the writer who made the assertion. But from our experience of the events in Armenia and Azerbaijan we know the kind of fatal role that some representatives of the intelligentsia, historians, and writers can play if they consider their main task to be the extolling of one people at the expense of another or at the expense of the interests of our whole motherland.

The search for non-Russians [inorodets], the search for the enemies of the people is an old, tried, and tested device. Did we not suffer enough from the suspicion of the thirties that we now have to go looking for enemies among our brothers and declare whole nations to be counterrevolutionaries. We speak about the growth of national self-consciousness. That is fine. Only not at the expense of Soviet national self-consciousness, the self-consciousness of citizens of the Soviet Union and of Soviet patriotism.

Somewhere I read the phrase: "The concept of the Soviet people is an invention." But the concept of the Soviet people is not an invention. Fortunately, it is reality. And it would be a great crime if we allow that concept to be eroded and respect for it to be lost.

Against the background of the serious events in the Transcaucasus some people laugh at Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy's dream of the time when the peoples of different nationalities will embrace one another and kiss. They assure us that this does not and cannot happen.

But let us recall how Kazakh women drove their animals to the liberated Ukraine in 1944 to feed their Ukrainian brothers and when describing those times still use Ukrainian words among others when they say: "We watered [napuvati—Ukrainian verb] our cows in the Volga." And we can remember how soldiers of all nationalities wept and embraced one other when they completed the encirclement of the fascists at Stalingrad, how everyone built Bratsk, and opened up the virgin lands. How they fought fascism in Spain. And, among other things, the tragic years of the war in Afghanistan were for our 20-year-old soldiers the years of the fulfillment of their internationalist duty, however we regard the war itself. And we in the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace are proud of the fact that the veterans of the war in Afghanistan entrusted us in particular with tending the

flame taken from the Eternal Flame at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier until such time as it is transferred to a memorial to those servicemen of ours who fell there. (Applause)

There is much that we can remember: the tragic, the shameful, and the beautiful. And all this is our common biography. The whole truth must be told about it. But without gloating because, I repeat, this is our biography and we are answerable for it.

Our aircraft is in the air. Its course is the right one. And tragedy can occur, I am sure, on only one condition: If we break our unity and if we allow the concept of Soviet patriotism to fade into oblivion.

Many people have spoken here about the fact that glasnost must not be used to insult people or to settle scores. That is right. But it is more important, a hundred times more important, to prevent this with regard to whole nations and peoples. Some newspapers have been publishing letters imbued with malice and slander against one nationality or another. Editors say: This is to demonstrate a particular viewpoint. Some literary journals have been publishing works that are anti-art with the sole aim of arousing the readers' hatred for, or distrust of, people of another nationality. We have a law in our country forbidding verbal attacks on people's national dignity. If we want a legal state we must apply it right now.

We need a law to ensure the accuracy of information. Deprived of the real statistical information, we believed Khrushchev when he promised the coming of communism in the eighties. I do not want to think that he was misleading us. But if he believed it, that means that he did not have reliable information. In the seventies it was announced that we were living in the era of developed socialism. Many people laughed at that but in their hearts the hope glimmered: Perhaps in some parts of the country things have been done that justify such statements.

But Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report said that only now are we realizing the full extent of the neglect of the economy. Thus, not even the Politburo had true information. And that is a most dangerous situation that brought us to the brink of tragedy.

It is necessary to seek a mechanism that would make it impossible for the people and the country's leadership to be given disinformation or incomplete information on the situation in the country.

The minor short-term advantages we gain from not reporting promptly about Chernobyl, the shooting down of the South Korean airliner, or the events in Nagorno-Karabakh subsequently turn into irreversible losses for us. The more truth there is, the more belief there is.

Svyatoslav Fedorov told me about his proposal that blind people should be examined in his clinic. He is sure that around 15 or 20 percent will recover their sight. And you know, many blind people refused. They had become accustomed to living that way, they have certain benefits, they do not want to see real life. This is a tragic parable. Unfortunately, it is true.

Glasnost helps us to draw the lessons from our own history including from the history of our propaganda. I mean here its tendency toward hysteria. Hysterically they extolled the virtues of corn; equally hysterically they then criticized it. Hysterically they reviled architectural excesses; then just as energetically they criticized characterless buildings. We either praise hysterically or criticize hysterically.

Let us try to examine the situation calmly: Where in our history is the grave tragedy of the people, where is their great heroism, where is there simply farce? Let us draw the lessons. It seems to me that in the context of restructuring, hysteria and hatred are counterindicated; they are the wrong spiritual state or emotions for that. Incompetence, stupidity, as well as blind faith are also counterindicated in restructuring.

There is another problem: Many people in our country know how to adapt very quickly to any changes and very often style themselves authors, fervent supporters, and champions of restructuring. We have such self-styled pioneers of restructuring. On all sides. The actions of such pioneers sometimes make me think about the literal origin of the word, the pioneer [zastrelshchik] of restructuring. We do not need demagogues, we need true pioneers and true builders of their own homes.

We chose our aircraft's route ourselves. We believe in restructuring. And that belief will be all the stronger the more truth we know. And then our aircraft will take the right course.

A French Communist, a worker, said recently to an activist of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace: "What is being done in your country now has restored my right to be proud that I am a Communist."

I do not think that a French Communist's opinion is crucial to us but, nevertheless, it is very good to hear such things said about our country. (Applause)

Platonov's Address

PM0407125988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by V.M. Platonov, secretary of the V.I. Lenin Chelyabinsk Tractor Plant production association party committee, at 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! Restructuring and the democratization of all spheres of our society's life, I think, are a phenomenon that has not been fully thought through and researched.

Begun on our party Central Committee's initiative, it showed the party's vital force and its ability to cleanse and develop itself. The basis of this no longer interests us from the historical viewpoint. We are more interested in the actual mechanism of this phenomenon because people's concern—as we were told by our Communists as we were leaving for the conference—is that a mechanism be developed that would prevent in the future a repetition of the regrettable mistakes of the past that we now know so well. Are things here not too tightly bound up with the individual, and what benefit does this produce? Often it happens that a wise, educated, and intelligent man is elected as raykom secretary, obkom secretary, or general secretary—in that case the system has worked, the rayon becomes an advanced one, the enterprise becomes one of the pacemakers. But it also often happens that a dim-witted man or dull individual is elected and things unfortunately go wrong. There are frequent examples of that kind, unfortunately.

Comrades! During the discussion of the Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference the main attention of Communists and nonparty people was drawn to problems of economic and social development. That is natural. Soviet people will experience restructuring only when we produce enough food products and consumer goods and when working and living conditions improve.

The radical reform of the management of the economy and the laws on the state enterprise and the cooperative system in the USSR have received support and broad approval. These measures have inspired hope and faith in restructuring and generated enthusiasm and the desire to work more efficiently.

Working people's increased activeness together with the economic interest of the collective have enabled our production association to resolve the kind of tasks that previously took whole 5-year plan periods to resolve. In just 2 years the association has renewed all types of current output and improved the technical standard, quality, and operating life of tractors and tractor engines. A new model of economic accountability within the production unit has been introduced. We are beginning to assimilate the shop contract. On this basis we have increased our own output and labor productivity by almost 27 percent in the first 2 and ½ years of the 5-year plan. Average wages for that period have risen by 6 percent.

But we are not content with our achievement. On the contrary, we have still not done enough to achieve real acceleration even though we are fulfilling the 5-year plan targets. What is holding us back, what is stopping us from working better and making more efficient use of production funds and resources? There are several reasons. One of them, as has already been mentioned here, is that the economic reform is imperfect and many of its elements have not been fully worked out. For example, there is no regulation on the state order. And therefore there is no arbiter, no court of appeal. This year the association's state order includes all types of output including those that are for its own consumption. For 1989 only new types of output are being specified. But instead they are regulating how many items should be made out of ceramics and composite materials, as though it is not the tractor itself that matters to the customer as much as the quantity of ceramics in it.

Our collective is worried by the decline in the reliability of economic ties. Some enterprises this year are refusing to fulfill contractual obligations for output supplies under obligations that have been traditional for many years. It is no use appealing to local party organs and primary party organizations, either. The present system of intersectorial ties and economically accountable claims and fines does not give enterprises' collectives an interest in the strict observance of contract discipline. Confusion has resulted. We restrict administrative measures by directives but economic ones still have not been created.

The situation is also aggravated by the slow development of the finance and credit mechanism, which does not satisfy the pace of restructuring. The ruble has still not become the sole measure of material assets and economic interests or the regulator of social benefits. We are continuing to resolve many tasks in the development of the economy, consumer goods production, and the distribution of material and social benefits not on the basis of interests but by means of pressure, with a disregard for interests.

In this connection I would also like to dwell on the application of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise. Only a short time has passed but already the kind of nuances have come to light that only manifest themselves in the process of the operation of the law. I think that it is important now to analyze this, to generalize it, and, if necessary, to amend this law. It is absolutely necessary to establish legal guarantees for the observance of this law and, of course, the liability for violating it. This is also important even in that section in which the USSR Law on the Cooperative System gives broader rights to cooperatives than state enterprises enjoy. Yet it is state enterprises that in economic competition must prove their capacity for dynamism, flexibility, and the efficient organization of labor and production. It seems to me that it is probably wrong to link the solution of the problem of food and consumer goods with the activity of cooperatives. This problem can be resolved only by state enterprises that have been given all the necessary potential for that. (Applause)

The transfer of enterprises to full economic accountability has revealed many shortcomings in the sectoral system of management. In their present form and conditions, ministries cannot but act as a brake. The problem of supplying material resources and components, a problem previously resolved by the ministry apparatus,

is now addressed to enterprises on the pretext of improving and strengthening direct ties, but those ties have begun to break down. However, because the ministries are responsible to the government for satisfying the national economy's needs for the corresponding types of output, they continue to pressure enterprises. (Applause) All this is convincing evidence that under present conditions it is advisable not to stop half way (there is nothing worse than half-baked decisions). It is necessary to abolish the industrial ministries and transfer some of their functions to the USSR Gosplan or the appropriate USSR Council of Ministers bureaus.

The experience that we have gained since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum has shown that the broad discussion of intraparty questions and the open and honest discussion about what is most sensitive and most worrying is the key to the solution of virtually all the urgent problems. But weaknesses have also come to light. They are the unpreparedness and inability of many Communists and the party aktiv to talk to people, to persuade, and to agitate. A number of Communists cannot perform these tasks because they are not held in esteem. New conditions also demand new forms of work from party organizations. It seems to me that this is what our party press is underestimating. When covering problems relating to labor collectives' work under conditions of full economic accountability and the democratization of all aspects of our society's life, it pays insufficient attention to the place and role of the primary party organization in these processes. Rather it seems to relish the failures. But there is poor coverage of experiments that run smoothly and efficiently. Nor does the work of the Central Committee apparatus, party obkoms, and other links meet the pace of restructuring. I believe that in tandem with the preparation and discussion of the Law on the State Enterprise, Central Committee departments should also have drafted recommendations to primary party organizations on how to work under these conditions. But that was not done (applause) and for that reason we were forced to act independently by trial and error. I believe that the party apparatus should work for the primary party organization. (Applause)

The status of the primary party organization secretary is an urgent question. He is not just a leader of Communists, he is the director of the party's basic link. All the conditions must be created for him to pursue a principled party line; he must be protected socially. In the opinion of our oblast's party aktiv this should also be reflected in the party statutes. I consider it expedient to empower primary and other local party organizations to use part of the receipts from members' subscriptions and other funds that have been earned in order to finance their activity and provide for the upkeep of the apparatus that has been released. (Applause)

Zakharova Notes Local Problems

PM0407092988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by O.M. Zakharova, operator at the "Yakutalmaz" Production and Science Association's No 12 Enrichment Factory, at 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] I am very grateful to have been allowed to address this conference as a representative of the diamond industry.

Comrade Delegates! Today we are examining problems that are vitally important to all Soviet people. The fate of our motherland depends on the decisions that are to be adopted here. Before my departure I visited many labor collectives in our Yakut Republic and very intensly sensed how many hopes people are pinning on our party conference. We simply do not have the right to disappoint their expectations. A great many resolutions and decisions have been adopted in the last 3 years, but the number of unsolved problems is incomparably greater than what has already been done. And here I totally agree with delegate Masaliyev that well-founded, specific decisions must be adopted. Accountability regarding their fulfillment must be most strict. In the process of the discussion of the Central Committee Theses, the Yakut Republic's collectives voiced many proposals, and I will probably be going over ground that has already been covered on some of them. It is very difficult to come after almost 40 speakers; it seems that there are no longer any matters that have not been discussed. Nonetheless, I will mention some of them.

Today there is a great deal of talk to the effect that there must be no unjustified secrecy in party life. In reality that is far from the case. For instance, the materials of Central Committee plenums are not published. I believe that working people should be informed of speeches that arouse a great public reaction. What are we afraid of? Our Soviet people will always realize who has the truth on their side. And they have really proved this by ardently supporting the policy of renewal and of returning to Leninist principles of socialism.

I think that there can be no question of a multiparty system. The party in our country has repeatedly proved at the most difficult times for the country that it is capable of implementing its vanguard role, rallying the people, and being a leader to them. It is a different matter that there must be constant debate within the party on the most important issues and correct decisions must be adopted on the basis of a comparison of opinions. A televised platform must be offered to any Communist, from ordinary workers to representatives of the highest echelons of power, for this purpose.

I disagree with the proposals regarding the possibility of holding elected party posts at any level for three terms, even with the proviso "by way of an exception." The limit must be just two 5-year terms, with election for the second term being at Communists' initiative. Party committee secretaries, up to and including the Central Committee, must be elected individually, by secret ballot. It is time to end the quota system in admission to the party, then fighters for restructuring will really join our ranks, and the assessment of the collective in which a person works must unfailingly be taken into account during admission to CPSU membership. The procedure

for leaving the CPSU must be simplified for those party members who regard themselves as being outside the party, but are afraid to leave its ranks, fearing persecution. We do not need dead wood. Other, worthier people will take their place.

I regard the raising of the question of certification as correct, but this must be approached very seriously; otherwise, it will become just another formality. Our Communists believe that they themselves should decide in light of the number of workers whether or not the party organization secretary is to work full time, since the party secretary works among the people.

Party committees should be permitted to retain some of the funds from the party budget; otherwise, party committees are humiliatingly dependent on economic leaders.

Our collectives are unanimous that the slogan "All power to the soviets!" should be really put into practice. Who if not soviet organs should decide questions of the economic and social development of regions, cities, and villages. But housing and municipal services, I believe, should not be departmental. We will make payments for maintaining them. But just take a look at our cities and villages! There must be a single client for urban development; there must be a single master who can put them in order.

The need for a change in the structure of party committees is long overdue. However, at the same time it is necessary to resolve the question of who is to assume the leadership of economic activity at local level. The organs of soviet power are still not ready for this role, and the adoption of appropriate legislative acts is required here.

There has been a lot of talk here about how bureaucracy is restructuring's number one enemy and about how we can eliminate it. So I think it is necessary to fully implement the Law on the State Enterprise. When we have gained independence, then much of the bureaucratic apparatus will become obsolete in simply economic terms; they will have nothing to dispose of and no one to whom they can give their valuable instructions.

Another of the reasons retarding restructuring is the lack of independent thinking. Over the decades we have been taught in school, the Komsomol, and the production unit to live according to the principles of blind obedience to the administration and higher authority, to "know our place," and "not to wash our dirty linen in public," and so we are now living in unsanitary conditions, in every sense of the word. (Applause) It is possible to increase people's activeness, to convince everyone that their opinion is respected, and to return to people their sense of being their own masters only on the basis of the broadest democracy, glasnost, and independence in all spheres of the life of our country and the collective.

Comrades! The Udachinskiy Mining and Enriching Combine, at which I work, is a subdivision of the highly profitable "Yakutalmaz" Production and Science Association. Since January this year it has been working under conditions of full economic accountability, but we, like many of the speakers here, have one problem—the economic accountability is in fact halfhearted and based on normatives. The economic normatives handed down to the "Yakutalmaz" association are clearly unfair. The association has been forced to patch up the holes and in turn to curtail the rights of its own subdivisions, our combine included.

A few words about the issue of our financial independence. It is necessary to more swiftly authorize wholesale trade in the means of production. Otherwise, if we are given the right to dispose of our profits, we will have nothing to buy with them, since the talk of how enterprises should engage in construction by means of the own-resources method is just so much hot air at present, because there are no quotas and allocations for construction materials.

Furthermore, the "Yakutalmaz" association, as a major consumer of machine-building output, has been placed in harsh conditions of monopoly diktat by the producer, on whom our level of productivity depends.

Thus the "Udachnyy" open-cut mine uses Soviet-made 110-tonne dump trucks from the Belorussian plant and 120-tonne Komatsu trucks from Japan. Unfortunately, the Soviet equipment is considerably inferior to the imported equipment in terms of its technical and economic indicators. And there is practically no equipment in versions adapted to northern conditions. Purchases of imported equipment were ended in 1986. The "Belazavtomash" Production Association, which the USSR Council of Ministers tasked with producing a special large-capacity dump truck for work in deep open-cut mines under the conditions of the Far North, is in no hurry and is promising to produce an experimental prototype some time in 1994-1995.

But the most galling thing, comrades, is that the Japanese who worked at our enterprise instantly, so to speak, took into account all their truck's shortcomings in operation, and new machines were already modified when they arrived. But the "Belazavtomash" specialists could not even find the time to look at the recommendations for improvements to their own truck that personnel of our truck pool took directly to the plant. We have to alter up to 50 assemblies on the trucks in primitive conditions.

Comrade machine builders! Please address our needs at last! After all, in the last few years the prices of the equipment that you produce have been growing several times faster than its technical and economic indicators. As a result all the republic's mining enterprises have

found themselves in a complex financial position, diverting huge funds into the purchase of inefficient but expensive equipment. They cannot fully resolve the needs of their social development.

Unless these questions are resolved now, the country's diamond-mining industry will be in a critical position as early as the 13th 5-Year Plan.

Comrades! At meetings working people and Communists often raised problems of social development. We totally support the opinion voiced in the report that a most important place must be assigned to social development in elaborating the 13th 5-Year Plan. And we are doing much to this end.

In the association we have elaborated a program called "Housing-2000." We are working on fulfilling the Food Program. But, in my view, we approach problems of the development of regions without taking their specific features into account, using a single yardstick. If a resolution is adopted on developing subsidiary farms, it applies to all corners of our state, the largest in the world. I think this approach is wrong. Although the popular song may say that "apple trees will blossom even on Mars," it is necessary to take into account both geography and natural conditions for planning purposes. Give us the opportunity to decide ourselves what to produce locally and what it would be cheaper to ship in.

The question of implementing the government decision on our right to join housing construction cooperatives in central regions of the country after a certain period of work in the Far North is extremely important for northerners. The right exists, but it is impossible to exercise it. Local soviet ispolkoms refuse to allow northerners to do this. We need manpower resources, they say, not pensioners. But excuse me, have these pensioners beamed down from another planet or something? They have worked honestly and in extreme conditions. Questions of increasing the number of children's health passes and family passes to rest homes and sanatoriums and of improving the quality of the supply of food, warm clothing, and medicines to residents of the Far North remain very important for us. These problems did not arise all of a sudden only today. We have repeatedly focused attention on them, at all kinds of levels.

In mid-May, Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov came to visit us, familiarized himself with our affairs, and deeply investigated our problems. We asked him to resolve a number of problems. I cannot regard our relations as consumerist, since we do not ourselves produce the items we are asking for. But now there have been refusals on many points. A request to Comrade Vorotnikov: Take another look at these problems. Is it possible to regard as correct a situation in which in our kray, where "it is winter for 9 months of the year, and the rest is summer," you cannot even get a full set of multivitamins at the drugstore and people have to walk around in more than 50 degrees of frost wearing clothes made from synthetic fur.

I am very grateful to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for his remarks about the lot of women in the report. I regard the raising of this question as very correct. A great deal has been said about the status of women in our country. Our ultimate aim is the total well-being of the people and the comprehensive harmonious development of the individual. But excuse me, what question can there be of my development as an individual when I spend much of my time as a housewife standing in line. I totally support the opinion of the comrades who spoke earlier. The Food Program must be resolved as a matter of priority. And I want to add that there should be a ban on decisions to construct any enterprises and complexes, however important, without creating what we now call "social, cultural, and consumer service facilities."

In conclusion I want to give you a small piece of information—Yakutia's diamond miners coped honorably with their socialist pledges and fulfilled the 6-month plan for commodity output by the opening day of the conference. It is a good tradition among us to give names to particularly large and valuable stones. We have not changed this tradition even now. We recently found a 155-carat diamond, which was dubbed "The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference." (Applause) Don't regard this as bragging, I think it is deeply symbolic. Our decisions must be as firm as that diamond. And our country must show gleaming new facets to the world after we have transformed it.

We, Yakutia's Communists, today vote for restructuring, democracy, and glasnost. The most important thing now is to ensure that the decisions that the 19th party conference is to adopt begin to be implemented in specific deeds without delay. (Applause)

Fateyev Addresses Conference

PM0407104588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 4

[Speech by A.M. Fateyev, second secretary of Leningrad CPSU Obkom, at 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! Political activeness has today reached high civic levels in Leningrad, as it has throughout the country. Party and workers' meetings, the press, discussion clubs, and amateur associations are contrasting positions and opinions and staging committed discussions about the extensive potential and tasks of the dynamic development of the economy and the social sphere, democratization, and glasnost. The Leningrad party organization wholly supports these processes and sees them as one of the guarantees of the irreversibility of restructuring. Without getting into fruitless polemics

with the authors of certain hasty newspaper and magazine articles about whether Leningrad is to the right or the left of other cities with regard to the transformations taking place, I would say that the Communists and all Leningraders have been, are, and will continue to be faithful to the glorious revolutionary traditions of our people and faithful to socialism. We state this firmly and responsibly.

Today, with 3 years of experience in implementing restructuring, one can see how complex and contradictory are the processes developing in society, how difficult is each new step forward, and how heavy is the burden of the past. Take the economic reform. It is now becoming clear that it has run up against the staunch conservatism of the sectoral management principle. Many people are now asking what is stopping us from doing more and whether the same fate will befall the current economic reform as befell previous reforms.

These fears are, to be blunt, not without foundation. There are many reasons for that. The directive decisions—often insufficiently thought through—that are being made on the introduction of the new economic mechanism, and, at the same time, the solid resistance shown by ministries and departments to enterprising proposals and innovative ideas are, in our view, one of the main brakes.

For instance, it took a group of economic leaders and specialists from Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast almost a year to win acceptance for the idea of creating in the region two intersectoral state associations removed from the jurisdiction of the corresponding ministries. This is a new organizational form of combining on a voluntary basis the scientific, technical, and production potential of industrial enterprises and scientific research institutes capable of securing breakthroughs in key areas of acceleration and implementing a strong social policy. Only the principled position of the party obkom supported by the Central Committee made it possible for the initiators to defend this project.

There are other cases, too. Life demands specific solutions, and they are not being carried out.

I will not repeat myself: Comrade Yarin from Nizhniy Tagil and others talked about ecological problems today. Obviously, many people have heard about the situation that has been created around Ladoga lake and the Kirishi Biochemical Plant. The public movement in defense of the environment is now broadly based. Local party and soviet organs are taking the necessary measures to normalize the situation; however, this is becoming harder and harder to do since, on the one hand, there are departmental barriers and, on the other, contradictory articles continue to appear in the mass media that are whipping up emotions.

In our view, we need objective scientific conclusions and decisions at state level—after all, this concerns the interests of hundreds of thousands of people.

These situations often force party committees to undertake economic functions. Sluggishness and sometimes plain indifference are particularly intolerable in determining areas of the economy. M.S. Gorbachev's report stresses yet again the need to focus efforts on one such area—the development of machine-building, which must indeed become a nationwide task. But how can the party Central Committee's clear directives on this score be reconciled with the administrative obstacles put in the way of their implementation!

A number of Leningrad enterprises with the active support of the obkom have been trying for 2 years to obtain permission to produce a holographic coordinate measuring system unparalleled anywhere in the world. The patent has already been acquired by many countries. But here the question was long held up in the offices of the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Machine Building, and the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology. The country continues to spend millions in foreign exchange buying these instruments—which are extremely necessary for Soviet machine-tool building—from abroad, where they are of poorer quality. Other similar cases could be cited. It is not a question of the number of examples, but of their essence. The main thing we will have to do is to restructure cadres' outlook and their attitude to work, life, and their civic duties, which is linked in the closest way with the reform of the entire political system. And this is a profoundly party-oriented task.

In proclaiming the policy of social renewal, the party has given a powerful boost to restructuring, and we believe that the question of increasing its prestige under the new conditions should be seen in light of the enhancement in every possible way of the role of primary party organizations. In complete accordance with the CPSU Statutes these are meant to be the real basis of the party. Their participation in the adoption of partywide decisions in particular should be weightier, if not decisive. This is one of the most important factors in developing democracy, and it is an idea convincingly reaffirmed during the discussion of the Theses for the forthcoming party conference. I think that this procedure for adopting program directives should become the rule.

We support the Central Committee's line of radically improving cadre policy. We consider it necessary for the conference documents to more clearly reflect the party's role in cadre placement and to give party organizations and their elective organs prime responsibility for nominating alternative candidates—both Communists and nonparty people—for corresponding posts. The development of the initiative and independence of lower-level party links will undoubtedly be promoted by the

enhancement of the role of elective organs and the granting to local party committees of the right to define the structure and functions of the apparatus.

Bearing in mind the new terms for their activity and reporting, the importance of the institution of candidate member of elective party organs should be enhanced, giving those organs the right to coopt new blood into their ranks from among candidate members and to replenish the ranks of candidate members with Communists recommended by primary party organizations via the electoral mechanism. This is particularly important for rayon and oblast bodies where, as practice shows, the membership of committees is sometimes reduced by more than half between elections. The provision of the Theses on the sociopolitical certification of Communists also triggered a wide-ranging discussion among us in Leningrad. Many people are inclined to the view that certification should be conducted within the framework of complete democracy, with the final decision on the question of party members being made collectively, within the primary party organization itself.

Restructuring itself is now certificating Communists. All party members should be checked by the main criterion of matching their actions to their words, by their specific contribution to the changes taking place. One of the fundamental questions of restructuring, of course, Comrades, is the full restoration of the powers and the role of the soviets. This problem is so serious and fundamental locally that it cannot be resolved at a stroke, at one fell swoop. First and foremost, it requires the elaboration of a legal base. It is necessary to reflect in detail the real rights of soviets in the corresponding section of the USSR Constitution, and to adopt a special law on soviets. And the principles and mechanism of the soviets' relationship with the enterprises and organizations located on their territory, as well as with state organs and institutions, should be clearly stipulated.

Vagueness on these questions is today often a source of departmental expansion that takes no account of the population's interests and position.

Broadly, the soviets must be given exhaustive rights to independently resolve all questions on their territory, while naturally excluding the other extreme—parochialism. I am convinced that, being thoroughly associated with the people, soviets will be able to defend people's interests.

It has to be admitted that the soviets are in dire need of people who are distinguished by their supreme responsibility and competence. That is why Leningrad people support the extensive introduction of democratic changes into the mechanism for electing deputies and shaping the soviets' apparatus. Approving the principle for electing to the Supreme Soviet representatives from social organizations that are part of the country's political system, we propose extending this procedure to the creation of local organs of power, starting with rayon bodies, and reflecting this in our conference resolution.

Furthermore, the enhancement of Soviet cadres' responsibility to the people and the ruling out of cases of favoritism could be served by the reinforcement in legislation of tried and tested conditions under which the opinions and recommendations of a labor collective and its party organization would be mandatory when accepting candidates for work in soviet institutions.

Comrades! The preparations for and the course of our conference clearly reflect the fundamentally new ideological and political situation in our society and convincingly confirm Communists' ardent commitment to revolutionary transformations. For the sake of this it is worth continuing the gigantic work which, at the will of Lenin's party, has been launched in the post-April period. (Applause)

Zagaynov Remarks

LD3006211088 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Our economy currently lies in contradictions, said German Ivanovich Zagaynov, head of a department at the Central Institute of Aero and Hydrodynamics, in his speech at the 19th party conference in Moscow. On one hand we have begun to introduce economic methods for the self-regulation of the national economy, while on the other we are orienting ourselves by gross output indicators.

[Begin Zagaynov recording] There are three criteria today that are the key to assessing our economic well-being: labor productivity, prime costs, and output quality. These three indicators should be stimulated by the economic mechanism and be the target function of the plan. Building up production is permissible only under conditions where these three indicators are fulfilled and where the demand exists. At the same time, efforts must be directed toward developing production capacities that have a high science content. And our enormous scientific potential must be put into operation more effectively, whether it is science at the level of the academy, industry, or higher educational establishments.

Here I have every right to reproach Comrade Abalkin. His speech contained criticism of the actions that are being taken but we have a right to hear from him, as the leader of an institute of economics, a developed and constructive action plan.

There are many problems in our science. Although there is a large number of scientific workers, you often come up against incompetence, failure to demand high quality

work, work that is not targeted toward the solution of key problems, a lack of high-intensity scientific quest, and essentially low levels of labor productivity.

The ways to solve these problems are well-known: democratization and the introduction of competition in the organization of science; raising scientific problems and the widespread discussion of them; exchanging experience, including with foreign colleagues; and the use of economic levers to stimulate scientific labor, thus making it possible not just to activate the talented potential but to eliminate the ballast that has built up.

Understanding the importance of all sections of the Theses, the Communists of our organizations that I have been able to visit before the conference believe that the fifth section, dealing with the party, is the key one today. The conference can adopt a specific resolution about that one in particular, the internal party issue, and it is obligated to do so. Speaking figuratively, the issue concerning the party stands as follows: We have to move away from a situation wherein the party becomes the state and turn it into the moral authority of our society, the ideological and political nucleus, and the vanguard on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The time has come for taking the most resolute steps along the path of democratizing the work of the party while retaining the positions of centralism and unity, for closing the road to the cult of personality, and removing direct economic functions from the party. Party forums and the work of the Central Committee must become a model of democratization and glasnost.

What are the specific steps? Limiting the terms for which one can be elected to leading party work in the Central Committee to no more than two terms, and that on a competetive basis by direct and secret ballot; and for the general secretary and the members of the Politburo this must be with the obligatory publication of their program. The structure of the Central Committee, its apparatus, and the specific duties of every member of the Politburo and the secretaries of the Central Committee must be published. They must give a regular account of the work, not only in the Central Committee but also in the lower organizations. And an end should be put once and for all to the method that has taken root of coopting leading workers.

In an interview with foreign journalists in connection with Reagan's visit, you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, said that you would like to know what Comrade Yeltsin said to the foreign journalists. We rank and file members of the party would also like to know that. In no way do we doubt the correctness of the Central Committee's decision on Yeltsin. But he is well known in the party for his resolute attitude in favor of restructuring. His incomprehensible repentance at the Moscow Gorkom plenum did not explain his position. Why did he not give an interview in our newspapers? We would like to hear his explanation at the conference. If it is some left-wing... [interrupted by applause] If it is some crazy left-wing ideas, then they will get the appropriate assessment. But if there is something that is good in his position, let us give it the proper assessment. [applause]

The issue of the press has also been raised at the conference. At congresses an editorial collegium should be elected and the PRAVDA reports should be listened to. The newspaper itself should be made an organ, not of the CPSU Central Committee but of the party. It is natural that the newspaper has to implement the Central Committee line, but it will retain the possibility of criticizing the work of the Central Committee and the work of individual members of it, and of doing so promptly. Party forums are too rare to prevent criticisms made at them from being belated.

Members of the Central Committee from the regions must not confine themselves to working only during the plenums. They must have a permanent area of work. Stormy discussion has taken place in the lower organizations about privileges as the source of alienation of the leaders from the masses, the germ of corruption of the leading party, state, soviet, and economic apparatus. But here there is no information for starting a discussion—we have better knowledge of Reagan's income and the budget of the royal family in Britain. But the solution of this question is a simple one. Extremely hard and effective work by leaders must be rewarded unstintingly, but there must be only one form of encouragement: that of pay. When everyone uses the same store, this will be an additional incentive for ensuring that the ruble is backed up by real goods. [applause] [end recording]

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0500 GMT on 1 July carries a similar report on the speeches made at the 19th All-Union CPSU conference, including a report on the address by G.I. Zagaynov, which, in addition to the above, carries the following passage: "In order to rule out recurrences of personality cult, to protect the party and society against degenerates like Shchelokov or Rashidov, the whole party should be made aware of the causes that brought the mortally sick Chernenko, a communist unpopular in the country, to the post of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It is necessary to describe in detail the activities of Grishin and Romanov. Such an approach will serve as a warning to anyone who attempts to hide his mercenary goals and careerism beneath revolutionary phrases about restructuring".]

Urges Yeltsin Explanation

PM0207130988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 4, 5

[Speech by G.I. Zagaynov, chief of a department at the N.Ye. Zhukovskiy Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute, at 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! The Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute was formed on 1 December 1918, 70 years ago, by a decree signed by Lenin. It was one of the first scientific institutes under Soviet power.

In the prewar years the institute was a symbol of scientific and technical progress in the country. And to this day this extremely large world-famous institute is in the forefront of aviation science and technology. It has raised a brilliant galaxy of scientists, among them Academy of Sciences President Mstislav Vsevolodovich Keldysh; a whole series of major institutes that are working effectively have emerged from it.

At the same time the institute's Communists are worried by the very ossified forms of work.

I want to take advantage of this opportunity, Mikhail Sergeyevich, to ask you to visit our institute, not for a festive jubilee but for a serious discussion of ways to develop science.

Our institute's collective, like other Ministry of the Aviation Industry organizations, is worried about the upcoming transition to self-financing and economic accountability. The Communists of one Ministry of the Radio Industry organization think that the transition to self-financing and economic accountability should be postponed; otherwise, disaster lies in store for them. For over 6 months now normative documents and instructions have been promised to the large group of sectors switching to this form of economic management. In January they were to be issued in no fewer than 17 documents. Now it is proposed to reduce the number, but the date has still not been set. We are simply afraid of being late, and anyway, when we look at the enterprises that have already switched to the new forms of work, we see that to a considerable extent what is happening is merely a repainting of facades and the diktat of the planned state order remains. The point is not only the preservation of directive-edict methods of work and bureaucratism, although these do of course occur.

The point is that our economy now suffers from a contradiction. On the one hand, we have begun to introduce economic methods of national economic self-regulation, and on the other hand we are fulfilling a 5-year plan that was conceived within the old economic management system and is geared to gross indicators.

In my view, the question of amending and maybe rescinding a whole series of 5-year plan control figures should be examined as swiftly as possible. We must resolutely bar the way to His Majesty Gross Output, the cost-based mechanism, and the squandering of our natural resources.

Today three criteria are crucial in assessing our economic well-being—labor productivity, prime cost, and output quality. It is these three indicators that should be stimulated by the economic mechanism and constitute the targeted function of the plan. The buildup of production is permissible only if these three indicators are fulfilled and the demand exists. Efforts here must be directed toward developing high-technology production units and our huge scientific potential—academic, sectorial, and VUZ science—must be more effectively brought into play.

The party conference is entitled to raise this problem, but what are needed for its practical solution are conferences and scientific and practical meetings involving major economists and innovative economic managers, including delegates of our conference.

I am entitled to reproach Comrade Abalkin here. His speech contained criticism of the actions that are being taken, but we were entitled to hear from him, as leader of the Economics Institute, a detailed constructive action program.

There are many problems in our science. Though there are large numbers of scientific personnel, we often encounter incompetence, an unexacting attitude toward the quality of work, work that is not geared to solving the key problems, a lack of intensity in the scientific quest, and essentially low labor productivity.

The ways of solving these problems are well known—democratization and competition in the organization of science and in the raising and broad discussion of scientific problems, the exchange of experience, including with foreign colleagues, and the activation of economic levers for providing incentives to scientific labor making it possible not only to mobilize the potential talent but also to eliminate the dead wood. Science needs its newspaper, as Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk said.

For all Kabaidze's brilliant uniqueness, I want to take issue with the simplistic slogan: "Switch all science to economic accountability." Economic accountability is certainly necessary. I am a fierce advocate of it and am sure that it will make many people work more efficiently. But on a basis of economic accountability you cannot make a powerful accelerator or unique wind tunnel, which costs tens or sometimes hundreds of millions; you cannot explore the Moon, Venus, or Halley's Comet. Only purposeful investment can ensure modern standards in science's experimental base, without which the organization of leading-edge fundamental research is inconceivable.

Though they realize the importance of all sections of the Theses, the Communists of those of our organizations that I was able to visit before the conference believe that section five—the one about the party—is the key one today.

It is on this—the internal party question—that the conference can and must adopt specific decisions; with regard to the other sections, the direction of progress can be outlined and recommendations can be formulated, but no final decision can be made. An effective decision on questions of the party's leading role and the democratization of its working methods will open up practical

ways of solving the other problems. Metaphorically, the question of the party is now posed in these terms: We must move away from the statization of the party and make it the moral principle of our society, the ideological and political nucleus, and the vanguard on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo headed by [vo gave s] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is the initiator of restructuring in the country. And our people and the whole world make the highest assessment of these initiatives. The time has come to take the most resolute steps along the road toward democratizing the party's work while retaining positions of centralism and unity, to bar the road to the personality cult, and to relieve the party of directly economic functions.

Party forums and the work of the Central Committee must become a model of democratization and glasnost.

What specific steps should be taken? The restriction of terms of office in elected posts in leading party work in the Central Committee to no more than two terms, with election being on a competitive basis, by direct, secret ballot. So far as the general secretary and Politburo members are concerned, they must publish their programs without fail. And it would be excellent if their viewpoints on ways of solving particular problems differed in some respects. They are outstanding, talented individuals with different experiences, and so, naturally, they must have viewpoints of their own that are in some respects unique.

Unfortunately, Politburo members and secretaries usually speak on specific matters, which does not make it possible to judge their position as a whole.

According to press reports, there is interesting progress in the Foreign Ministry. Comrade Shevardnadze has formulated a number of principled positions regarding this, but this has not been widely publicized in the press.

In his speech in Tolyatti Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, while supporting restructuring, at the same time expressed misgivings about ideas that are alien to us (this question requires a more detailed discussion, and you cannot just make do with a simple rejection of ideas and name-calling)—the unacceptability for our country of Western market forces. But the market as an efficient means of feedback in the economy is an extremely ancient invention.

For many years we organized the economy according to the laws of direct regulation, without effective feedback on the whole range of parameters of the national economy. But, as is well known from general management theory, such a mode of regulation inevitably leads to distortions. Stable economic development is possible only given the existence of socioeconomic and economic, including market, feedback. (Applause) The state will implement its targeted programs not via directives but by using economic levers. The alternative to this is the directive-edict method. I would like Comrade Ligachev to speak out with greater clarity on this issue. (Applause)

The structure of the Central Committee and its apparatus and the specific duties of each Politburo member and Central Committee secretary must be published. They must report regularly on their work not only in the Central Committee but also in grassroots organizations.

The established method of coopting leading personnel should be ended once and for all. Cooption is suited to underground and wartime conditions, but in peaceful conditions it is a source of bureaucracy and careerism and of sluggish evolutionary development in the party, the economy, and science. At the same time a solicitous attitude must be shown toward cadres who have proven their worth in party work, and they must not be lost from the aktiv after the end of their elected term.

Our democratic institutes must be such that not only the formal but also the informal leaders of the country, republic, oblast, and city can exert an effective influence on public opinion. The case of Churchill is instructive. He personified Britain for about 50 years, although he was prime minister for only 10.

In your interview with foreign journalists about Reagan's visit you said, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that you would be interested to know what Comrade Yeltsin had said to foreign journalists. We ordinary party members would also be interested to know. We in no way call into question the correctness of the Central Committee decision on Yeltsin, but he is a man well known in the party for being resolutely attuned to restructuring. His unintelligible repentance at the Moscow Gorkom plenum did not clarify his position. Why has he not given an interview in our papers? We would like to hear his explanations at the conference. (Applause) If they are crazy leftist ideas, they will be appropriately assessed; if there are sober elements in his position, let us study them. (Applause)

The question of the press has been raised at the conference. Opinions have been expressed that the newspapers should not chase after sensationalism and inflame passions. Once again, it is the journalists among us delegates who must make this assessment of the work of the press. But in one respect demands on newspapers must be increased: Facts must be checked and presented objectively. For instance, in its 17 May issue PRAVDA, which gladdened us all with the rebuke to Nina Andreyeva, cited two facts from the life of our institute. The journalist, Andrey Tarasov, simply did not check one of them on the spot and, despite the opinion of a scientifically and morally strong collective that enjoys tremendous prestige in many dozens of organizations, he distorted the second to suit his own intentions as author. But these problems do not change our position. The PRAVDA editorial collegium should be elected at congresses and reports should be heard from the newspaper.

The paper itself should be made not an organ of the CPSU Central Committee but an organ of the party. (Applause) Naturally, the paper must pursue the Central Committee line, but it will retain the opportunity to criticize the work of the Central Committee and its individual members—in a timely fashion. Party forums are too rare for criticism at them to be other than belated.

Central Committee members from the localities must not be confined to working only at plenums; they must have a permanent sector of work. It is most rational to use representatives of grassroots organizations in the Central Control Commission, which must be reconstituted in its Leninist form.

In order to preclude recurrences of the personality cult and protect us from degenerates such as Shchekolov and Rashidov the broad party masses must know the mechanisms, including the mechanisms that brought the mortally sick Chernenko, who was not very popular in the party, to the post of general secretary. The truth about Grishin and Romanov must be told. The point is not to punish any of the living witnesses or accomplices (unless crimes against the party and the state are involved), but let this serve as an awful warning to those who conceal mercenary aims and careerism beneath revolutionary phrases about restructuring.

In connection with the aforementioned names there was turbulent debate in grassroots organizations about privileges as the source of leaders' alienation from the masses and the seed of corruption in the leading party, state, soviet, and economic apparatus. But there is no information here to start a debate. We know more about Reagan's income and the budget of the British royal family. This question is easy to solve: Extremely intensive and efficient work by leaders should be unstintingly encouraged, but there must be just one form of incentive—wages. When everyone shops at the same store it will be an additional incentive to back the ruble with actual goods. (Applause) Why should the question of democratization and glasnost in the Central Committee's work be raised to sharply? The aim is clear: Practical work by the Central Committee matching up to the standard of glasnost and democratization will produce results in the restructuring of the work of grassroots party organizations. A living example is better than any slogans.

In conclusion, I want to note that party forums should be held more often in this revolutionary period; 5-year periods should not be the reference point. (Applause)

Nizhelskiy, Gorbachev Exchange

LD3006224988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] Describing the vital interest of the collective of his enterprise in speeding up restructuring and the factors which are slowing things down, Vadim Yuryevich Nizhelskiy, a gas worker at the Orsk-Khalilovo metallurgical combine, said the following [at the CPSU 19th All-Union Conference]:

[Begin recording] [Nizhelskiy] A heat-treatment and pickling complex in the rolling mill—an 800 mill—has been under construction at our combine since 1983. The cost of the complex, together with the building and assembly work, is R109 million. Although the equipment is imported and it was purchased in 1978 and transported almost immediately to the combine, commissioning of the plant was set for this year. But at present we are still missing 900 tonnes of pipes—which means 150 km—of different diameters, communications facilities of different kinds for equipment assembly, and 400 tonnes of chemical resistant paint.

Well, our construction trust, also from Novotroitsk, complained everywhere. In reply to the latest appeal, Comrade Lukashov himself, the chairman [position as heard] of Gosplan, said this: It is essential for the labor collectives to try hard to put their facilities into operation on time. In his speech Mikhail Sergeyevich said that bureaucrats do not have to be beaten, you have to get rid of them by democratic means. Take this example. Why are such formal replies necessary?

[Mikhail Gorbachev] No, in cases like this, you know, the law must operate, and that's it. This....

[Nizhelvskiy, interrupting] I submitted a paper from the conference to the Construction Department of the Central Committee. I believe that all leaders of that rank are Communists; and you can always ask them, as you can any Communist.

[Gorbachev] My view is simply this: Of course, we are not going to fight a monster like bureaucratism unless we bring in the whole of the democratic process, the whole of society, all the mechanisms.

[Nizhelskiy] Naturally.

[Gorbachev] Unless we do so, we won't defeat it. You know—no decisions here; one here, then another—all that is nonsense. What we have to do is to redesign our political system and use that as a foundation. And when these kinds of things arise, the law must act, the rayon committee must act; and people like that must not carry a party card. There you are right, and there I agree with you. These are different things. But it is essential to get to the bottom of it. [applause] [passage omitted on Nizhelskiy proposal that all efforts be concentrated on solving the food problem] [end recording]

Nizhelskiy Speech Published

PM0407110988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by V.Yu. Nizhelskiy, gas unit worker at Novotroitsk's Orsko-Khalilovskiy metallurgical combine, at 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Communists and party conference delegates: I won't keep you long. I am the fourth metallurgist and worker to be given the opportunity to speak today. This fact can certainly serve as an illustration to some extent that either the situation in metallurgy is very grave in many aspects, or we are particularly ardent supporters of restructuring.

The comrades here have already said a great deal. I have rewritten my speech two or three times. I simply would like to cite one specific example that very vividly illustrates restructuring and the way it is proceeding at the local level.

At our combine a thermal etching complex for the "800" mill's rolled metal shop has been under construction since 1983. The cost of the complex and construction and installation work is R109 million. Moreover, the equipment is imported. It was bought in 1978 and shipped to the combine almost immediately. The combine has no storage facilities for such a large quantity of equipment, so for a long time it lay out in the open while the decisions were made on when to start construction and where to construct the complex, and it began to deteriorate. Then construction began to be financed through centralized channels. This year is scheduled to be the year of commissioning for the complex, but 900 tonnes, or 150 km, of pipes of various diameters for various utilities and for equipment installation have still not been delivered. Similarly, 400 tons of chemical-resistant paint has not been delivered.

"Novotroitskmetallurgstroy," the construction trust in our city, has appealed at all levels. The last appeal, which we sent via the party obkom to the USSR Gosplan, prompted the following response from Comrade Lukashev, deputy chairman of Gosplan: "It is necessary to mobilize labor collectives' efforts to ensure unconditional commissioning of the project at the designated time."

The second thing I would like to say about this project is this. Since the equipment has been lying out in the open for 10 years, and it will now take considerable capital investment to bring it up to scratch, the losses stemming from the commissioning of this complex will cost our collective R12 million.

Last year our combine made a profit of R87 million, but, according to the normatives, we were left with only 17 percent of that sum. If the strong-arm pressure of planning continues in this way, we will never prove anything to the people. We will have nothing to pursue our social policy with.

I would also like to make a few remarks about this. Mikhail Sergeyevich said in his speech that bureaucrats should not be castigated, they should be led onto the democratic path. But take this example. Who needs formal replies like that?

M.S. Gorbachev: No, the law must act in these cases, you know.

V.Yu. Nizhelskiy: I handed in a paper to the conference, to the CPSU Central Committee Construction Department. I think all leaders of that rank are Communists. And they can always be called to account as Communists.

M.S. Gorbachev: I simply believe that, of course, we cannot combat the monster of bureaucratism unless we activate the entire democratic process, all society, and all mechanisms. We won't overcome it. It's not just a matter of making one decision or another—that's all rubbish. We must reshape our political system. The law must act, the raykom must act. But such a person should not have a party card. You are right about that, and I agree with you. They are different things. But we must get things clear. (Applause)

V.Yu. Nizhelskiy: I also want to add, comrades, that our Orenburg delegation has come up with the following proposal. We have heard speeches from a great number of people. For instance, the health minister said that resources are needed. Representatives of science also said that resources are needed. And great resources for education. It is clear from the example of our metallurgical industry that it is obsolete in many respects. Therefore, resources are also needed here. But we cannot solve all the problems at once. Maybe there's some point in narrowing the focus and concentrating efforts on just one program. Our proposal is this: that efforts be focused on resolving the Food Program, so that the people can see some real return in the very near future. (Applause)

M.S. Gorbachev: Correct, Vadim Yuryevich.

V.Yu. Nizhelskiy: Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke today before dinner and said that we....

M.S. Gorbachev: What, did I spoil your dinner?

V.Yu. Nizhelskiy: Don't throw me, this is my first speech at such an event. You didn't spoil my dinner, but you did cause me some confusion. Indeed, the remark that we do not know how to plan is justified.

I am a worker with secondary technical education. I can carry out some specific economic analysis from where I stand of what we have in the country. But I cannot see the prospect, the strategy, even the economic strategy, still less the party one. The proposal regarding the chairman of the soviet, not just the city, oblast, or rayon soviet but also the Supreme Soviet, came as a surprise to me personally. And my immediate reaction was to reject it, because I think the two posts can in no way be combined. That is a purely emotional reaction.

I would like to hear the opinion of competent comrades about this. As yet we have not heard it, for some reason. (Applause) So my personal proposal is this: Maybe we should not be in a hurry, we have already been in such a hurry—with the laws on the state enterprise and labor collectives. They immediately cease to work as soon as we adopt them. Now we should carry out something like an experiment, on the scale of a few oblasts and cities, and see what comes of this before the congress, say. That is my proposal, comrades. (Applause)

Lithuanian Chief Songayla

PM0207183788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by Ringaudas-Bronislavas Ignovich Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, at 30 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Dear Comrade Delegates! Thousands of Communists and nonparty working people of the republic have discussed with great assertiveness and interest the CPSU Central Committee Theses, put forward many proposals, and expressed support for our party's Leninist policy of restructuring. They have all been collated and submitted to the CPSU Central Committee. A summary of the main proposals was also published in the republic press in the form, as it were, of the working people's instructions to the conference delegates. All this is convincing testimony to the fact that among our people faith in the party and in the policy of restructuring which it is pursuing is strengthening, and their endeavor to support this policy with mind and heart and in word and deed is growing. The positive changes in the economic and social development of our republic also confirm this.

I shall not cite figures but will say that we have summed up the preliminary results for the first half of the 5-year plan. The quotas of 2 years 6 months for the basic indicators of economic and social development are being fulfilled successfully. It is important that this has been secured mainly thanks to intensive factors of development. But, as has been said perfectly correctly by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the comrades who have spoken, the positive results which have been achieved are no grounds for speaking of a breakthrough in socioeconomic development.

We are making far from full use of the production potential, which has been created, and of our other reserves and opportunities. The work of the central economic departments and union ministries merits special attention, we believe. The report was right to say that their position should be more assertive and flexible. It seems to us that, granted the cutback in the managerial machinery, insufficient attention is being paid to the restructuring of the style and methods of its activity.

There is much talk about economic methods of management, but administrative diktat continues. Why, for example, are questions concerning the state commission (this has already been discussed) and economic norms being tackled inadequately? Unfortunately, the preparation of the decree on the state commission has dragged on. The initial work of the wholesale trade mechanism is also inadequate. Time is passing, we are incurring losses, and people are starting to lose faith in the economic reform.

In our view, we should also be listening to the voice of scientists and production workers concerning weak and contradictory parts of the State Enterprise Act itself. It is necessary, we believe, to close off all loopholes permitting limitation on the independence and infringement of the rights of the work force and never to permit these things to happen from now on.

We fully support the proposition that, as of next year, it is essential to struggle more emphatically for fundamental changes in structural policy in the sphere of the manufactured product and capital investments. But this measure must not be confined merely to the base sectors of industry—that is, machine building. The report was right to emphasize that the level of development of construction industry and construction materials industry fails to correspond to requirements. It is necessary to pay the most serious attention to these sectors immediately. After all, there is an acute shortage of many construction materials, and they have become a serious impediment to the development of capital construction, fulfillment of the housing program, and the construction of cultural facilities particularly.

Life itself dictated the point in the report about the need to restore the economic balance between city and countryside. It is understandable that we will not solve the food problem without this. A priority in structural policy for the foreseeable period should be, we believe, the further socioeconomic development of the countryside, particularly housing construction. The success of keeping people in the countryside, particularly the youth, depends primarily on this today.

In the process of the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses the working people of the republic, Communists and nonparty persons, raised extensively the question of giving greater independence to the union republics in the solution of a number of economic, social

and, particularly, economic problems. The corresponding amendments to the USSR Constitution should evidently be made on this question.

The ecological situation taking shape in Lithuania is very inauspicious. The public is worried by the state of affairs at the Ignalina AES. The construction of the third power unit is in full swing, but there is no approved detail design as yet. A number of important points in provision for work safety, seismic stability, and fire safety have yet to be agreed. For this reason we deemed it necessary to propose to the country's government a halt to the construction.

The air pollution level in a number of cities of the republic exceeds the permissible norms. Kurskiy Bay and the Baltic are becoming polluted. There are still no purification works in the republic's second biggest industrial center, Kaunas. All this is largely a consequence of the fact that a number of union ministries considered and continue to consider environmental protection a secondary matter. This is why in the course of the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses questions were raised pointedly and frequently about the accelerated construction of environmental protection facilities, the protection of historical and architectural monuments, and the restoration of the old parts of cities, of the city of Vilnyus particularly. All these questions need to be tackled more actively.

About regional economic accounting, briefly. It is our science's opinion that, given due study and well-considered application, it could contribute to a broadening of the rights and the enhancement of the responsibility of the republics and regions for the accomplishment of an entire set of tasks of economic and social development with regard for statewide interests. The contribution of each region to all-union property could be better gauged and monitored here.

Comrades! We support the report's proposals concerning reform of the political system in our country. Formulation of the question concerning the clear-cut delimitation of the functions of the party and state authorities is opportune and vital. We fully support the party's policy of a revival of the sovereignty of the soviets of people's deputies responsible for the economic, social, and cultural development of the corresponding territory.

At the same time it is very important to perfect the content, focus, style, and methods of party work. Our party organ and organization efforts should be concentrated on ideological and organizing work and the training and assignment of the personnel.

The proposals concerning a change in the structure of the party authorities are opportune also. But it should be a question here, we believe, not so much of a cutback in the party machinery as of a reallocation of forces in order to strengthen with personnel the party's basic components—the raykoms and primary organizations. The proposals on according the republic and local party authorities greater independence and initiative on these matters also deserve attention, I believe. Why, for example, is the question of the number of offices of dismissed primary party organization secretaries still decided in the CPSU Central Committee machinery, and their allocation in the union republic Communist Party central committees.

In the interests of shifting the focus to live work with people, it is essential to reconsider the periodicity of party meetings and party committee plenums with a view to reducing them. We should concentrate our main attention on strengthening the party ranks. Without doubt, it is essential to abandon the mechanical regulation of the growth of the party ranks. We should also simplify the procedural process of admittance to the CPSU and cut down on the multilevel process of hearings and the number of documents which have to be drawn up.

Preparation for the conference was for all of us a grand school of intraparty democracy. It was a difficult business because there was some uncertainty, specifically about the procedure for electing delegates to the conference. It is essential to put this right in the future in order to have a firm safeguard against possible mistakes and so there will be no reason henceforward for any reproaches and accusations of a breach of party democracy. As far as the election of both deputies of soviets of all levels and members of elective party bodies is concerned, it is necessary, we believe, to confine ourselves to two terms.

Comrades! The report makes an entirely correct evaluation of the state of the party's ideological work. The stringent conclusions which have been heard at the conference concerning this most important area of party activity we apply fully to our republic party organization as well. An elevation of the requirements of ideological work is being called for by the activity of informal movements and associations. They have also appeared in our republic. Advocating a broadening of democracy and glasnost, these movements and associations could contribute to realization of the party's policy of restructuring. But for this it is necessary to intensify party influence on them.

We cannot, first of all, put up with those who aspire to put themselves outside of our political system and who under the flag of democratization and glasnost are attempting to push views alien to socialism and dictate their will to the party organizations. Not estranging but rallying people on the basis of the principles of socialism and internationalism—such is our mission.

Concern has been heard justifiably at the conference about the state of inter-nation relations in some regions of the country. Among other aspects which have been dealt with here, there has been talk of dealing with the issue of the language problem.

The issue of the national language as the official language of the union republic was, in particular, raised extensively in the course of discussion of the Central Committee Theses. A positive solution to this issue is possible, we believe.

Comrades! Lithuania's Communists will, in close unity with the fraternal peoples of our multinational motherland, apply all efforts and energy for fulfillment of the decisions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. (Applause)

Aydak Condemns Official Privelege

LD3006184788 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—Speech by Arkadiy Aydak, chairman of the collective farm "Leninskaya Iskra" from Chuvashiya, near the Urals, concluded the working day of the 19th all-union party conference today. Speaking with strong emotion, he criticised the administrative-command system of management which, he said, "resulted in the fact that we have been living for a long time mainly at the expense of peasants, their unpaid work." "Then there has been oil, and the selling out of natural resources to purchase food products abroad has been a crime of the heroes of the period of stagnation against our history and the succeeding generations," he said. This largely happened due to the fact that lower-standing structures of the party were deprived of the opportunity to influence the system of the making of state decisions.

The chairman of the collective farm noted that almost all categories of citizens now have some privileges or other. It is necessary to put an end to this state of things once and for all so that all these privileges, above all for high officials, be reduced to a common denominator, the pay depending on the amount and quality of work. This, in the opinion of the speaker, will prevent the penetration of the party by all sorts of time-servers.

The delegate went along with the proposal advanced in the report about the need for a transition to economic methods of management. The chairman of the collective farm is of the opinion that with regard to the rural areas this must be manifested in a real opportunity of free choice of better equipment. For this purpose it is necessary to put an end to the monopoly position of giant plants. If there is no competition among plants there will be no quality farm equipment, the speaker holds. Aydak dwelt on the reserves which could be tapped to increase appropriations for the reconstruction of the rural areas. This, above all, is the [words indistinct] deflect huge funds for the implementation of immense construction projects, the improvement of the functioning of the mining and processing industries and effective use of secondary raw materials. He proposed an end to the budgetary (?balancing) of amelioration construction and suggested that irrigation projects be built only on the funds and on order of collective and state farms in accordance with the system of their inner arrangement.

In conclusion the speaker expressed the opinion that in order to encourage the initiative of people it is necessary to remove the fear of the possibility of a return to the personality cult. Leaders should be elected for two terms without exceptions for anyone, Arkadiy Aydak said.

Belorussians Note 'Favorable Conditions'

LD3006161188 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—"Belorussia, compared to other republics, was less affected by the negative phenomena of the stagnation period. This is because the main party principles, such as collective leadership, party comradeship, a sense of responsibility and openness, were preserved in their purity in the republic," said Yevgeniy Skuro (Maksim Tank), chairman of the Board of the Union of Writers of Belorussia, a delegate to the 19th all-union party conference, speaking at the press centre of the conference of the Soviet Communists today.

In his opinion, this left its mark on the life of the party and the people of the republic, creating favourable conditions for the realisation of the creative potential of the Belorussian people during the period of restructuring.

"Our republic has reached a high level of economic development and, in principle, could adopt internal republican cost-accounting to be independent in its economic development. But the decision to this effect concerning Belorussia, as, incidentally, for, say, the Baltic republics, must take account of the existing traditional economic links. I do not think it would be correct to wrench Belorussia from the living fabric of its relations with all other Soviet republics," Yevgeniy Skuro said.

Questioned about the privileges for the party members in Belorussia, Yefrem Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia, said that "our chief privilege is that out of two holidays which all the Soviet people are entitled to, we use only half a day a week for rest." He also pointed out that in the republic there are no privileged "closed shops" for party members in positions of leadership since "there is no need for that: Belorussia is well-provided with food and industrial consumer goods." None of the party workers, with the exception of the members of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the party, have country houses given to them by the state. Incidentally, Central Committee Bureau members pay monthly rent for those houses and move out altogether if they resign, Yefrem Sokolov said.

Delegates Comment on Speeches, Debates

PM0107102588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by special correspondent Yu. Orlik: "Palace of Congresses, Third Day"]

[Text] A distinguishing feature of the present conference is that its participants have not assembled to approve decisions prepared in advance—they are elaborating them. They are disputing some points of the report, disagreeing with speakers' opinions, seeking the solution of the complex problems facing our society.

Construction worker Vladimir Lavrinenko from Kharkov is 26 years old. He joined the party in 1985. On his chest is the Order of the Red Star. For Afghanistan. He is pleased with the conference's general progress.

"But not all the speeches are constructive, not all contain specific proposals. Indeed not everyone ventures to display such valor—to look truth in the eyes—as was displayed by Ulyanov and Zagaynov. I should like the names of the people who do not want to work or are unable to work in the new way, those for whom it is time to go, to be named directly from the rostrum."

A. Zhalis, chairman of the Klaypeda Gorispolkom (he has been in soviet work for 20 years and before that he worked as party gorkom secretary) is cautious about the proposal to recommend the first secretaries of the relevant party committees to the posts of soviet chairmen. He fears that this might lead to the excessive concentration of power in the same hands.

And the Estonian delegation, which initially intended to state its disagreement with the proposal which had been put forward, having carefully considered and weighed up everything once more and listened to M.S. Gorbachev's explanations on this score, reached the conviction that the proposed system will place the first leader of the rayon, city, oblast, or republic under the control of the people. A secret ballot will make it possible to determine whether the proposed candidate is an effective political leader. At the same time this restructuring of the soviets accompanied by the transfer of authoritative powers to them will relieve the party organs of functions which are not properly theirs.

One more meeting—with M. Vagin, chairman of the Lenin kolkhoz, Gorkiy Oblast. I ask him what needs to be done to fulfill the Food Program.

"I repeat what was stated at the kolkhoz members' congress," he said. "If we stop preventing the peasant from working—matters will go well."

The situation in which the present conference is taking place is far from the usual decorousness. It has its own drama, which keeps the auditorium in a state of tension. This is connected with the polemically sharp speeches by individual delegates on the main agenda, in which things are called by their names and the ruthlessness of criticism is equaled only by the passionate desire and readiness to remake our life for the better. But sometimes passions also become heated on the periphery of the conference's main action. We have in mind in particular the tense state of anticipation of the delegates when the chairman gave the floor to G.P. Razumovskiy for the report [spravka] from the Mandate Commission. At the previous session the conference had instructed him to investigate how justified was the assertion, contained in the article "Confrontation" published in the journal OGONEK, that there are bribers among the conference delegates.

According to a statement from the USSR Prosecutor General, G.P. Razumovskiy said, the USSR Prosecutor's Office has made no decision to bring criminal charges for bribery or other crimes against any of the people elected conference delegates. The information cited in the article "Confrontation" needs to be specially checked. In the opinion of the Mandate Commission this should be done by the USSR Prosecutor General and the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. They must report the results.

Voices were heard from the auditorium: "The floor should be given to the editorial office to explain what is happening." "Is Comrade Korotich there?" the chairman asked. Voices from the hall: "He is. He is a guest." Chairman: "No, he is a delegate." M.S. Gorbachev specifies: "He is a delegate from Kherson. We have to wait for him to come down from the balcony." And here was V.A. Korotich, chief editor of OGONEK, on the rostrum.

"When the senior investigators of the USSR Prosecutor's Office, the legal generals so to speak, Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov, who are in charge of the cause of the entire Rashidov mafia and are now dealing with the Churbanov case, turned to us" he explained, "they provided specific proof and raised specific problems. They said that some of the people implicated in these cases, against whom a large quantity of evidence had been accumulated, could in no way be taken to court."

V. Korotich then said that the leaders of the investigation had frequently addressed reports on the subject to the CPSU Central Committee, on the last occasion on the eve of the conference. V. Korotich handed over to the conference presidium the reports from the USSR prosecutor general's investigation group for particularly important cases and the list of all addresses to the CPSU Central Committee.

In general it should be said that a lot is being said at the conference about the role and responsibility of the press and the mass media. But if you look at the problem more broadly, essentially it is a case of people's attitude toward glasnost, toward criticism as a means of society's political and moral self purging and of the individual's

spiritual emancipation. I shall not give my own assessment of what was said, sometimes in a truly concerned manner and sometimes simply indignantly, about the press—it is easy to accuse a journalist of professional bias. Let's listen to what others have to say.

I. Vasilyev, writer:

"You have the right to scold someone if you love them. In all assessments and in criticism you must proceed from the desire for benefit, for good."

Sh. Amonashvili, general director of the Georgian science and production teaching association:

"The mass media have offended the bureaucrats. And those who wear uniforms have also taken fright. The press is taking a very close look at their activity. Of course, the press is also making mistakes, it is also learning."

The conference—you can sense this—is becoming more businesslike and enthusiastic with every passing day. It is a really crucial political forum from which important decisions are expected by the entire population.

Kryuchkov Comments on Melnikov Speech

LD0107034188 Moscow TASS in English 0148 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—"We regard it as natural and useful that there is a lively debate at the party conference, that critical remarks are addressed to the Central Committee of the party, to the government, ministries and individual leaders. This is a characteristic feature of the present forum of Soviet Communists", deputy chief of the Department of Organisational Party Work of the CPSU Central Committee Georgiy Kryuchkov said today at a meeting with journalists at the press centre of the 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU.

Answering the question about the speech made at the conference in the Kremlin by head of the party organisation of the Komi Autonomous Republic Vladimir Melnikov who named several leaders, among them Andrey Gromyko, who, in his opinion, "actively conducted the policy of stagnation" and "must account for this in person", Georgiy Kryuchkov said that a note from delegate Maleyev had also been read out at the party conference. "The note says that Andrey Gromyko's entire activity has passed in full view of the party and the people, that he devoted all his efforts to the service to the cause of our motherland, and now he was declared in an off-hand manner to be almost an adversary of perestroyka," Georgiy Kryuchkov said, summing up the contents of the note. "The author of the note is resolutely against this view."

The representative of the CPSU Central Committee said that when the note was read out, there was stormy applause. "This is a natural course of the conference," Georgiy Kryuchkov said. "Every delegate expresses his or her opinion. I would not make a conclusion on the basis of Vladimir Melnikov's viewpoint that somebody would be relieved of his post."

More on Armenian Leaders' News Conference

PM0107151988 Moscow TRUD in Russian 1 Jul 88 p 4

[I. Belov and Ye. Shulyukin report: "Space for Renewal; Reportage From Party Conference Press Center"]

[Excerpt] Yesterday began unusually early for many journalists accredited to the party conference press center. At 0800 hours they were given a chance to talk with G.M. Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and other representatives of the republic's Communists. The bulk of the questions, to a greater or lesser degree, concerned the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. Correspondents from the United States and Britain were especially interested in this. Moreover, we got the impression that not all of our Western colleagues had attentively familiarized themselves with the speeches delivered by delegates from the conference rostrum. Only the day before the first secretaries of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Communist Party Central Committees had spoken in detail about the Nagorno-Karabakh problem.

During the news conference, the participants noted that the roots of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem lay in the period of the personality cult and the years of stagnation. It was precisely at that time that mistakes were made in nationalities and socioeconomic policy. The autonomous rights of the oblast, and sometimes even the human worth of the people living in Nagorno-Karabakh, were ignored. The speakers were united in the belief that it is essential to create a clear, well thought out mechanism for the best, constitutional solution to the interethnic problem that has arisen. They reported that joint work and coordination of actions in this direction are being conducted with the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee. The journalists were told that five delegates (four Armenians and a Russian) representing the Communists of Nagorno-Karabakh were included in the Azerbaijan SSR delegation taking part in the work of the conference. [passage omitted]

Fourth Day Proceedings, Speeches Reported

Conference Session Round-Up

LD0107223388 Moscow TASS in English 2209 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—The 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU continued its work in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on July 1st.

The morning session was presided by A.A. Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The delegates debated M.S. Gorbachev's report "On Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the Tasks of Promoting Perestroyka".

The following comrades spoke in the debate: V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow Regional CPSU Committee, A.A. Melnikov, adjuster of the chassis production shop at the Volzhskiy car factory named after the 50th anniversary of the USSR in Kuybyshev region, F.T. Morgun, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection, G.Ya. Baklanov, editor-in-chief of the magazine ZNAMYA, B.V. Gromov, army commander, N.K. Yemelina, director of the Smolensk knit goods factory, B.I. Oleynik, secretary of the boards of the Union of Writers of the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ye.M. Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The afternoon session was chaired by M.S. Solomentsev, member of the Political Bureau, chairman of the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee. The debate of the report was started by S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia.

The floor was asked by Yu.F. Surkov, a team leader from the Moscow plant for the working of special alloys. He was critical of a number of speakers who used the rostrum to make standard self-accounts instead of speaking in a constructive manner.

The debate was then resumed by Comrades K.M. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan, G.A. Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education, B.M. Volodin, first secretary of the Rostov Regional CPSU Committee, and B.N. Yeltsin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Construction, minister of the USSR.

The evening session was chaired by M.S. Gorbachev, member of the Political Bureau, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The speakers in the debate were comrades G.I. Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar Regional CPSU Committee, S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, V.I. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia, Z.P. Pukhova, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women, Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Political Bureau, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the FRG, S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan and V.G. Afanasyev, editor-in-chief of the newspaper PRAVDA.

At that deliberations on the report were ended.

At the close of the deliberations, the floor was asked by the following delegates: V.A. Volkov, secretary of the party committee of the Sverdlovsk engineering plant named after M.I. Kalinin, N.S. Chirkirev, general director of the "Machinetool Manufacturing Plant Named After Sergo Ordzhonikidze" scientific and production association, Moscow, I.S. Lukin, first secretary of Moscow's Proletarskiy District Committee of the CPSU.

They expressed their attitude to V.I. [as received] Yeltsin and to his speech at the conference.

Then the delegates began to discuss the conference's draft resolutions:

"On Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th Party Congress and on the Tasks of Promoting Perestroyka" and "On Democratisation of Soviet Society and a Reform of the Political System".

"On Combatting Bureaucratism".

"On Interethnic Relations".

"On Glasnost".

"On a Legal Reform".

One hundred and fifty people had spoken in panel discussions of the documents.

Reports on the work of ithe commissions for drafting resolutions of the conference were delivered by the commissions' chairmen: M.S Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Ye.K. Ligachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, A.N. Yakovlev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and A.A. Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Following an all-round discussion, the draft resolutions were adopted with all amendments and additions.

A concluding speech at the conference was made by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev. On an instruction of the Presidium of the conference M.S. Gorbachev introduced a proposal to adopt a resolution entitled "On Some Urgent Measures for Practical Implementation of a Reform of the Political System of the Country". The resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates.

The 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU was declared closed.

The party anthem "Internationale" was performed.

Better Lot for Women Urged

PM0407132588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 7, 8

[Speech by N.K. Yemelina, director of the Smolensk knitwear factory, Smolensk Oblast, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! I represent the Smolensk Oblast delegation and, on its instructions, I would like to report that people from the Smolensk region ardently support the party's policy of restructuring and unreservedly hope that the party will complete the work it has started.

Esteemed Comrades. Previously adopted resolutions by the party Central Committee and the Soviet Government and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report have repeatedly emphasized that the consumer goods we produce are virtually second in importance after foodstuffs. There is no question that the task has been set correctly, and we must apply all efforts to justify this trust and increase the output of consumer goods so that they are no longer in short supply in the stores.

I would also like to say that, in order to solve this problem which is very important for the country, it is necessary to give special attention to light industry. At this stage we are not talking about the number of people participating in production but about the technical standards of the textile industry's equipment.

Orders for our equipment were placed on time with the Ministry of the Defense Industry and the Ministry of the Aviation Industry. But since this state order has not yet been received by enterprises under these ministries, they have done virtually no work on manufacturing the equipment for us. Consequently, at a time when some have not yet started manufacturing equipment for us while others have already stopped doing so, our life is becoming very difficult and we find ourselves in very serious difficulties.

I would like to say, Comrades, that this questions now perturbs us greatly. If the Ministry of the Defense Industry and the Ministry of the Aviation Industry were to include the manufacture of our equipment in the state orders, the winners would be not just the light industry enterprises but the country's population as a whole. This would certainly have an effect on the quality of manufactured output. We are in extreme need of this. I would like to mention that none of light industry's representatives has spoken at the conference in all the time since the day when M.S. Gorbachev delivered his report.

Kabaidze said here that he was fed up with going around cap in hand, like a pauper. But what else can be done since our light industry enterprises pay 70 percent, and some even 80 percent of their profits to the state budget and the ministry, and the remaining 20 or 30 percent must be used to develop the industry, build housing, and achieve the best possible results.

We have been working in conditions of self-financing and full economic accountability for 18 months now. In this time our profits have increased by 50 percent, but what I mentioned earlier prevents us from channeling more funds into housing construction. Women make up the bulk of our workforce, and they feel more strongly than anyone else the special need for better housing conditions, for better working conditions. I would like to see this particular question specially emphasized at the conference; I would like to see your expression of approval and support for even better housing and working conditions for our women. Believe me, they will display tremendous responsibility and will give of their free time to tackle the tasks facing them, they will try to do everything possible to fulfill the plan, to fulfill the state orders. It must also be borne in mind that people in light industry work more overtime than anywhere else.

I believe, Comrades, that it is necessary finally to examine the question of the payment of part of our profits directly to the ministry. More of the profits must remain at the enterprise's disposal. Our labor collective councils were set up for a good purpose and, in my view, the ministry must coordinate with them the amount of funds to be deducted for the solution of their questions and problems, and not the other way around. I think that this deserves attention and will be supported by light industry representatives. (Applause)

Comrades, I unreservedly support what was said here by previous speakers as regards the party's policy. I believe that the CPSU's role must certainly be raised to a new level. I say this not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of people from the Smolensk region. We fully support the party's policy not in words but in deeds and we will implement it. We will try to work even better. (Applause)

Gorbachev Opens Afternoon Session

LD0107092088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Our program continues to update you on progress at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. Half an hour ago, the afternoon session of the conference began in the Kremlin. It was opened by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with a brief statement on the agenda for further work. Then the debates on the CPSU Central Committee report were continued. Debates were also held at the morning session where, among others, the audience was addressed by the secretary of the USSR Union of Writers Board and editor in chief of the ZNAMYA magazine.

Gives Report on Procedure

LD0107113988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] After a short interval, the afternoon session was opened by Mikhail sergeyevich Gorbachev. He gave a report to those assembled on the procedure for the conference's further work. He proposed that the debate should be ended at the evening session and should then go on to discuss the conference resolutions.

Solomentsev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, chaired the session.

Moldavia's Grossu Address

LD0107152088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Speech by S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, on 1 July at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Text] Speaking of soviets having full power and doing everything to that end, on no account must the party's role in, and responsibility for, tackling the tasks of accelerating our country's social and political development be curtailed; Lenin warned against that. This is quite logical, since politics and economics constitute a single whole. However, here we are talking of the political—and consequently, a more refined and more effective—influence being exerted by party committees on economic affairs—an influence through the minds and souls of people and not through all manner of technocratic levers, levers which we have become accustomed to over many years.

As the discussions that have taken place have shown, attitudes toward the new model of the party's interrelations with the soviets are not unequivocal. What puts one on one's guard is the desire of some discussion participants to go for weakening the CPSU's role in our society and for separating it from the state.

One can encounter in the press reflections about the necessity of setting up a unified democratic front, which would be made up of Communists and people who do not belong to the party, Soviet officials, and members of informal organizations, groups, and individuals; of opening up the doors to all those who wish to join the CPSU.

Citing the importance of searching for unusual approaches in the conditions of restructuring, certain polemicists have, in actual fact, begun to disparage the role of the working class as the main social force for renewal and to put forward the intelligentsia as being in the vanguard. Party committees are being presented as the greatest opponents of restructuring.

On the eve of the conference, at our meetings with labor collectives, we were frequently asked: why is it that some papers have recently begun to fan fears about the outcome of restructuring, while the preparations for the highest party forum were being identified with the rubicon—the last, decisive battle? Are these errors really a coincidence?

The main thing, however, is the fact that no reaction was forthcoming from the ideological departments of the CPSU Central Committee. In our view, these opinions about the CPSU, and opinions in a similar vein, opinions about its potential, instead of mobilizing the working people, engender lack of confidence and do not facilitate restructuring but mitigate against it, giving rise to nationalistic phenomena and conflicts between nationalities.

On this issue, too, the conference evidently ought to make its final views felt. If one is to speak of genuine helpers of the party during the period of restructuring, then these are, first and foremost, the social and political organizations, unions of artists, societies which represent almost the entire active population of our country. This is an enormous force and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev did the right thing in the report when he set the task of sharply stepping up the activities of these organizations in support of restructuring.

The party began restructuring and the party should be in charge of all strata of society which take part in its implementation. Today, as never before, we must all of us show a greater degree of balance and political responsibility, concentrate the party's creative force on our society's present and future, without being oblivious to our people's historic past and all the tragedies and deformations it has lived through.

In order for the party to strengthen its role as the political vanguard of our society it is, it seems to us, necessary significantly to enhance and make more precise the statutory rights of primary party organizations, to expand their participation in the implementation of the cadre policy, to introduce an institute of secretaries of party organizations who have been released from other duties, for party bodies to retain the right of final approval—and, if necessary, of recall, at any time—of the leading cadres of economic, state bodies and public organizations.

It is necessary to radically renew intraparty life, to implement a structural reorganization of party bodies, and to change the mechanism of democracy and control within the party.

Grossu Speech Published

PM0307121088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 8-9

[Speech by S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, at 1 July afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Delegates! The role of organizer of the Soviet people in the comprehensive revolutionary renewal of Soviet society and the acceleration of its socioeconomic development was assumed by the CPSU. It collectively elaborated the general line of restructuring and substantiated scientifically its strategy and tactics, and now it is steadily and consistently putting it into practice, without giving in to difficulties.

Restructuring is becoming increasingly deeply entrenched in our society, exerting a positive, transforming influence.

The delegates from the Moldavian republican party organization completely and utterly support the fundamental conclusions and principles contained in the report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the course set by the party toward restructuring, acceleration, and the further democratization and renewal of Soviet society's life. They believe that the present conference will be truly epoch-making and will justify the Soviet people's aspirations and hopes.

I must stress that the stagnation phenomena, command-and-administer methods of economic management, ostentation, and other negative phenomena did not bypass our republic. The republican party organization, showing party-minded courage, openly admitted its responsibility for the serious mistakes made in the period of stagnation, and with the active support of all the working people launched a resolute struggle for the fulfillment of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, the 27th party congress, and the CPSU Central Committee Resolution on Moldavia.

At plenums of the Central Committee there has been unanimous support for the CPSU's line of the revolutionary renewal of society and searching assessments have been made of the activity of many party committees and organizations and soviet and economic organs. There has been sharp criticism of the work of a large number of leadership cadres, many of whom have been severely punished and removed from their posts. The uncompromising and consistent struggle being waged on a united front against negative phenomena of various kinds promoted the normalization of the moral and psychological climate and progress along the path of acceleration and renewal.

At the same time it should be admitted with the utmost frankness that in our republic restructuring is not proceeding as fruitfully as was envisaged by the 27th CPSU Congress decisions. Inertia and certain recurrences of the past are playing a part, and not everything has been done to accelerate scientific and technical progress, intensify production, and strengthen discipline, order, and organization.

As was rightly noted in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, many problems have accumulated in the republic's agro-industrial complex, and stagnation phenomena have still not been overcome. These simply cannot be explained solely in terms of unfavorable weather conditions. In the near future a Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee plenum will examine the question of progress in fulfilling the Food Program and a package of additional measures will be drawn up for increasing the production of grain, feed, and industrial crops, as well as livestock produce, including an increase, per head of population, of at least 25 kg in the production of meat, carcass weight, and of 100 kg in milk production.

A central place in the implementation of radical transformations in the countryside is assigned to the switch to the new conditions of economic management. Unfortunately, in this sphere of the economy there are many unresolved problems. The most serious of these is the lack of balance in wholesale, purchase, and retail prices for the output of the agro-industrial complex.

The current operating system of prices is based on a cost-based mechanism and does not take into account the economic laws of socialist production or the equivalence of relations between industrial sectors of the economy and agriculture. Can it be right when, instead of the activity of enterprises producing goods and food being evaluated on the basis of retail prices, which reflect the consumer properties of goods, their quality, and consumers' demand, it is evaluated on the basis of wholesale prices, which orient the enterprises' work toward the warehouse rather than the consumer? Changes in the pricing mechanism, along with the struggle to reduce the prime cost of output, have become inevitable factors in the restructuring processes in our economy.

We have studied these questions carefully and we believe that if we are instructed to do so, from 1990 the republic could implement a new pricing procedure in sectors producing industrial goods and food, establish normative relations with the all-union budget, and go over entirely to regional self-financing.

Esteemed comrades! The radical transformation of the sociopolitical and organizational foundations of our socialist system requires the elaboration of new approaches to the concept of the exercise of power. The question of power is the main question of restructuring. Its unprecedented urgency and importance became clear in the course of the nationwide discussion of the theses. The need for a clear division of functions between party committees on the one hand and soviet and economic

organs on the other became absolutely clear. However, the times require not merely a redistribution of powers. The Leninist nature of political reforms under socialism consists mainly in delegating the greater part of management functions, that is, handing over real power to the soviets and the labor collectives.

If the soviets are to cope successfully with their functions in the new historical conditions and become organs of true people's power, they must be restructured organizationally, reinforce their ranks considerably with capable workers, and improve the cultural and professional standard of the body of deputies. The Moldavian party delegation unanimously supports the proposal of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on setting up soviet presidiums at city and rayon level consisting of veterans and the most authoritative deputies and headed by party committee secretaries, on a voluntary basis [na obshchestvennykh nachalakh].

This will help, first, to eliminate the paradox whereby a soviet in effect has the role of an appendage to its own executive power, and it will promote the stepping up of work with deputies and standing commissions and the improvement of control over ispolkoms. Second, in the conditions of the reorganization of the party and the transfer of management and economic functions to the soviets, along with the functions of sector subunits of party organs, the CPSU as a ruling party must fulfill its functions as the leading political force of our society through its representatives on the supreme organ of state power. We believe that this work should begin this year, during the party reports and elections.

I also regard as entirely correct the question raised in the report of expanding the USSR Supreme Soviet, setting up permanent, numerically small chambers of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities, and electing the Supreme Soviet chairman by secret ballot.

This major reform of the political system would considerably step up the activity of the organs of supreme power and the prompt resolution of questions of legislation and sociopolitical life, and should bring into action all components of the socialist system.

In the conditions of the increasing economic, cultural, and cadre potential of all the Soviet republics and autonomous republics, there is also an urgent need to further develop the soviet federation. The basis for improving relations between nationalities is the party's policy line aimed at satisfying the needs of all nations and ethnic groups and ensuring strict fulfillment of the provisions of the USSR Constitution.

However, the constitutional enshrinement of the Leninist princples of the sovereignty and equality of the union republics is sometimes forgotten. As a result not infrequently there are instances of republican organs being under the direct command of union organs, territorial interests being ignored, and an unbalanced socioeconomic policy being pursued, along with petty tutelage and unfounded checks, which fetter initiative and autonomy in decisionmaking.

Life poses many problems of the relationship between nationalities within the republic, too. We see their resolution in the all-around development of democracy and the strengthening of our society's unity and its international essence. We have recently devoted particular attention to the development of national and Russian bilingualism, the national culture of the Moldavian people, and the spiritual life of the Gagauzi, Bulgarian, Jewish, and German populations, who have long been inhabitants of our region. We realize that far from everything has yet been resolved in this or other issues. But we do not allow hasty conclusions, we seek careful consideration and reason.

In discussing full power for the soviets and doing everything to this end, we must in no circumstances allow the underestimation of the party's role and responsibility for resolving the tasks of accelerating our country's socioeconomic development, which Lenin warned against. And that is only natural, since politics and economics are a single whole.

However, it is a question of political influence, and that means more subtle and effective influence, by party committees on economic affairs. Influence through people's hearts and minds, not through all kinds of technocratic levers that we have been accustomed to for many years.

As the debates have shown, attitudes to the new model of relations between the party and the soviets are varied. The desire of some people to pursue a line of eroding the CPSU's role in our society and separating it from the state is alarming.

Opinions can be encountered in the press on the need to form a united democratic front incorporating Communists and nonparty people, soviet employees, and members of informal organizations, groups, and individuals, and to open the door to allow anyone wishing to join the CPSU to do so.

Citing the importance of seeking nonstereotyped approaches in the conditions of restructuring, certain polemicists have begun in effect to disparage the role of the working class as the main social force of renewal, and to place the intelligentsia in the vanguard. Party committees are held up as the greatest opponents of restructuring. People even say that we have "no country."

On the eve of the conference we were often asked at meetings in the labor collectives: Why has anxiety for the outcome of restructuring been whipped up recently in certain newspapers? Preparations for the highest party forum were equated to the Rubicon, the last, decisive

battle. Can that be a question of accidental errors? But the most important thing is that there was no reaction from the CPSU Central Committee's ideological departments.

In our view these and similar arguments about the CPSU and its potential, instead of mobilizing the working people, generate a lack of confidence and work not for, but against restructuring, prompting nationalist phenomena and conflicts between nationalities. Clearly the conference must have a decisive say on this matter.

If we are to speak of the party's real helpers in the restructuring period, they are, first and foremost, the sociopolitical organizations, they are the creative unions and societies which represent almost all the active population of our country. This is a tremendous force. And Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was right, in his report, to set the task of sharply stepping up the activity of these organizations in support of restructuring. The party started the restructuring, and it should lead all strata of society participating in its implementation.

Today more than ever before we must all show more thoughtfulness and political responsibility and concentrate the party's creative efforts on the present and future of our society, without forgetting our people's heroic past, with all the tragedies and deformations they experienced.

If the party is to strengthen its role as our society's political vanguard, it is, we believe, necessary to increase and clarify considerably the statutory rights of primary party organizations, extend their participation in the implementation of cadre policy, introduce the institution of full-time secretaries of party organizations, and retain the party organs' right to the final approval and, if necessary, recall at any time, of leading cadres of economic and state organs and public organizations.

It is necessary to renew intraparty life radically, carry out a structural reorganization of party organs, and change the mechanism of democratic control in the party. In this connection I fully support the idea of setting up a single control and auditing body which would be, like the CPSU Central Committee, a supreme organ of party power, only with control functions. The existence of, in Lenin's phrase, this organ of the party and proletarian conscience will create the best possible conditions against possible errors, abuses of power, and violations of the Leninist norms of party life.

The key to resolving the whole range of problems connected with the party's exercise of its vanguard role in present-day conditions would be the further development, within the framework of socialist democracy, of such reliable defense mechanisms as glasnost, democratization, freedom to express thoughts and opinions, and constructive criticism, which work for restructuring and for socialism.

The party's will and the people's enthusiasm are the guarantees of the attainment of the cherished goal, of the irreversibility and total triumph of restructuring. Today action is needed everywhere. Only through practical action can we consolidate our achievements and finish what we have begun. That is how we understand our party duty. That is what the broadest masses of working people demand from us. (Applause.)

Brevity in Speeches Urged

PM0307123988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 9

[Speech by Yu.F. Surkov, worker at the Moscow special alloy plant, at 1 July afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades, I am a worker at the Moscow plant for the processing of special alloys. As already mentioned here, our conference is practically running out of time, and I cannot sit here and watch how this time is literally being squandered by some speakers here. (Applause). In this connection I would like to draw the attention of our party leaders to the fact that the reports of first secretaries are marked by a stereotyped approach, no matter how strange this may seem. I am amazed at the robotization which is under way in the work of the apparatus. Why is this happening? In my view, it is due to poor work within the party in regard to the education of leaders. This can be felt in all spheres. In the party, among writers, everyone is clearly aware of it. Why is this happening? It is because one official or other can decide the fate of all others. How? There is evidence of nepotism in our country where high or middle posts are filled by people with family connections. (Applause).

I do not have a speech, rather an outburst from the floor, in response to this atmosphere. I believe that special attention should be accorded to leaders and their education and that the obstacles which litter their path should be removed. If we had leaders everywhere who are capable of finding their bearings and inspiring the masses to follow them, then we would not have appeals like those which some people here have addressed to Comrade Gorbachev asking him to come and look into the situation at local level and resolve specific problems. (Applause). Therefore I am appealing to those who will take the floor after me to pay attention to the speeches that are being delivered and not engage in repeating each other. There was an excellent example set by a metal worker here, who in the course of the conference shortened his speech several times and retained in it only what he considered necessary, only what had not been said before. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

[M.S. Gorbachev] I second that! Well done!

[M.S. Solomentsev] I believe, Comrades, we should take note of this statement.

[M.S. Gorbachev] And bear it in mind.

[M.S. Solomentsev] The comrades who will take the floor should bear it in mind.

Makhkamov Addresses Conference

LD0107163288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Speech by Kakhar M. Makhkamov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Communist Party of Tajikistan, at the 1 July session of the 19th CPSU All-Union Conference in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] From this platform, we have heard a deep analysis of the road that has been travelled since the April plenum and the 27th party congress of the state of the economy and ways of boosting it, the political situation in the country, and the party's tasks in the new stage of deepening restructuring.

The open and businesslike exchange of opinions here reflects the spirit of restructuring, glasnost, and the democratization of all aspects of the life of our society. Opinions have also been expressed that the country's economy has allegedly not yet emerged from stagnation, something with which I radically disagree. Is it not an enormous achievement that, thanks to the efforts of the party and the people, the country's slide toward economic and sociopolitical crisis has been halted?

Since the April plenum, the economic reform has been giving positive results in our republic, too. But our accomplishments in implementing the social program to develop the agroindustrial still fall short of the directives of the 27th party congress. One of the reasons for many of the shortcomings amounts to the fact that at a particular moment inconsistency has appeared, our efforts to solve economic tasks were scattered, the stage-by-stage approach was violated in the fulfillment of the program.

At the same time, a psychological attitude based on getting swift results from restructuring managed to take shape in people's minds, especially with regard to raising living standards. The approach based on serious, creative labor was pushed, as it were, into second place. This manifested a certain failure to work things through on the part of the republic's party organizations. This also happens because there are a number of elements in the economic mechanism which have not yet been sorted out: In general, there is a balance between plans in the capital construction field, but only on paper.

The most important guarantee of the success of restructuring is unity of word and deed. This is precisely what people expect from us, especially where social policy is concerned. But divergence here has not yet been overcome. Let each of us ask himself: Do our plans always correspond to the available resources and possibilities? Divergence between word and deed threatens to lower the people's confidence in restructuring. We expect realism in economic policy. We all understand that restructuring needs to be backed up ideologically in a powerful and effective way. However, it is disappointing that quite a few of our ideological workers today have turned out to be poorly prepared to operate in an atmosphere of democratic changes and growing public activeness; that is due to a variety of reasons.

The democratization of all aspects of the life of society and glasnost have been received in proper fashion by the majority of the people—that goes without saying. Unfortunately, the opposite manifestation does take place. All of us see that today individuals and even groups of people who call themselves fighters for justice are trying to get into the foreground, and sometimes not without success. Their true essence, however, is one of demagogy. We still have no experience in combatting this new manifestation by using democratic means. Weapons against this must be created. In our view, these could be laws of glasnost and on the press.

The concepts of democracy, glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism have firmly entered our practice and have ceased to be mere slogans. But we must not view them as ends in themselves, in isolation from practical affairs. It is our task to make these concepts, in their inseparable unity, reliable working tools in the vital tasks of economic development, social policy and promoting the well-being of Soviet people.

Falling Education Standards Seen

LD0107145188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Jul 88

["Excerpts" of speech by G.A. Yagodin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Education, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 1 July—recorded]

[Excerpts] Education bears a special responsibility to the country and the party. That is why questions of restructuring education have been at the center of post-congress work. You know that the February plenum has been held. The political decisions which ensure the possibility of a breakthrough have been determined. This is understandable. In recent years, the ratio of education in the country's national product has been steadily reduced and is now two or three times less than those countries we wish to catch up.

The domination of administrative-command methods of management and the underestimation of the role of intellectual labor has had a very grave effect on education.

The school is but a cell of society. It has reflected, just like a mirror, all our ills. And so formalism, percentage-mania, and authoritarian methods of teaching education

have all had their effect on the school and have led to an acute drop in professional standards. This is the cause of the majority of our major failures and miscalculations.

Only one method is possible to achieve success in the education sector. This method is democratization. The school must be emancipated. It is (?diverse), and the main collective of teachers are devotees; they are professionals, and they are profoundly moral people who devote themselves totally to the cause of upbringing and teaching. We must allow them to operate according to how they see things. [passage omitted]

I think that even now collective leaders have been given broad rights. But they are unable to make use of them; they are afraid to do so. We must create such regulations about schools and educational establishments so that it should not be so terrible, and so that these regulations protect the educational establishments from all kinds of arbitrariness. The drafts of such documents are being worked out. We shall be publishing them in August, and then we shall discuss them at August conferences and at the congress of workers in education. I believe this is a most important matter. [passage omitted]

Yagodin Discusses Education Tasks

PM0507092588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 9

[Speech by G.A. Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education, at 1 July afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! We often use the word "crucial," and this is a very far-reaching definition because the fate of the country is indeed being determined in terms of substance, measures, and actions. Public education bears particular responsibility to the state and the party on these questions. That is why the questions of restructuring public education were at the center of post-congress work: The February plenum was held and political solutions determined, ensuring the possibility of effecting a breakthrough. Karamzin was correct: The educatedness of the people constitutes the strength the state. Some things have been done in this context: The budget has been increased and school construction has begun moving. But these are the merest trifles when compared the tasks facing public education. Just look: Half of the schools in the country do not have central heating, running water, or a sewerage system. One-fourth of the schoolchildren study in two shifts, some in three. Some 1.5 million children do not have the opportunity to go to kindergarten. In the last 10 years we have slipped from 9th place to 23d in terms of the number of students per 10,000 inhabitants. Why?

These are old troubles. There has been practically no increase in recent years in the amount of the country's income spent on public education.

Building up intellectual potential and professional skill also contributes to production efficiency. Moreover, this is a cheaper contribution. Everyone realizes that it is more effective to invest in man. However, current troubles do not give us a chance to do this immediately. We are living on a very tight budget. Today is hampering the day after tomorrow.

Of course, the prevalence of administer-and-command methods of management and the underestimation of the role of intellectual labor had a very grave impact on education. The school is simply a cell in society; it merely mirrored all our troubles. Formalism, obsession with school grades, and authoritarian methods of education and instruction all made an impact and led to a sharp drop in professional standards. This is the cause of most of our major failures and miscalculations.

Radical changes are needed in the practice of public education. The purpose of the general school is a central question. Very often people began to view VUZ's and higher education in this light and began to determine the quality of a school by whether its graduates went on to higher schooling or not. This is not the purpose of a general school. The school must prepare pupils for life, for independent life in modern society with a profession. It must prepare them to constantly broaden and deepen their knowledge and skills. This is true also for VUZ's, but not necessarily only for VUZ's. We now take 17 percent of school graduates into VUZ's and will do a little better; we will take 20 percent, but only 20 percent. We do not set for ourselves the task of taking 100 percent into VUZ's. That problem does not now exist.

Instruction in school is very intensive now. I believe that it is unnecessarily intensive, excessively so. Schoolchildren's existence and education must be made easier.

What approaches are being examined? Beginning education at the age of 6 or 7 years for 3 or 4 years is the first stage of primary school because children do not develop physically in the same way. A child of 6 may look like an 8-year old, but may unfortunately also be at the level of a 4-year old when aged 7.

Complete assimilation of material must be the condition for transfer from primary school to the next stage. Complete knowledge must be acquired here; as soon as a child who can't read goes into the fifth grade, we have already made him deficient, so to speak, at that age. That's the trouble! That is why teaching must be repeated, if need be, during the first stage.

During the second grade professionalism must be fostered and the foundations laid in basic subjects. No one must be overlooked and schoolchildren must not be allowed to lose their identity. The amount of exact sciences must be reduced slightly for those who are not studying these subjects and supplemented by what was previously called art—joinery work and carpentry—in

order not to transform a person into a second-class citizen and then drop this second-class citizen once again into the working class. This is society's most important task.

Finally, the third stage of school must be made substantially easier and open to options. I believe that the number of subjects must be radically reduced to 5 or 6 instead of 11. Let children choose their subjects; it is not important that there will be different testimonial certificates and different knowledge. They are different now too; the only need is for the certificates to have the same juridical rights. (Applause).

I would like to say that there are serious problems to think about in the work of vocational and technical schools. Substandard teachers and deprived children must not be sent there. What is happening? What kind of new working class, what kind of reinforcement are we preparing in a socialist state? This is incorrect and immoral and must be nipped in the bud. (Applause).

The attitude toward emotional culture and toward that part of education which takes place via emotions must be changed. A person's happiness depends to a very small extent on whether he can work out a square root. A person's happiness in life depends on his sense and perception of life. We are carrying out this work most unproficiently, and even the most important school subject, literature, requires substantial adjustments. We have already done a great deal to render it socially practical, to turn it into an illustration of historic, and even what I would call class, processes. Some of the taste and content of belles lettres must be restored. And of course, history. Comrade Makhkamov, we were forced to cancel the history examination this year; next year we will have to come back to it. This is a fundamental subject. The situation took shape in such a way that we could not place either a schoolchild or a teacher in an unprotected position on an ideological subject. Of course, we need to improve music and art education, because this is also education and a part of upbringing.

The foundations of international education are laid in school. Socialist internationalism is not nonnational. It is based on national pride, progressive historical traditions, and respect for one's native language. I agree with Boris Ilich Oleynik on this point. Equality in studying native and Russian languages is the key to resolving many problems. Why are we not resolving them? Because we try to teach Russian in national schools in Russian language lessons. And we teach this nationality's native language in Russian schools during lessons in this national language. It is impossible to teach in this way. Textbooks in all subjects should be in two languages. A Russian textbook should have a very brief resume in the native language and vice versa. This must be done in all subjects. Then this question will be resolved in practice.

We resolutely support the broadening of the rights of educational establishments and local soviets to improve the teaching of national culture, the history of the peoples, and the national language. We believe that this is the most important problem now.

Comrades! We seek help on one question. Textbooks are a vital problem for us. They set the standard for education. Several years ago we made a mistake from the very best of motives: We switched to free textbooks in schools and passed them on from class to class, from generation to generation, thus taking them out of the home. But they are desperately needed in the home. (Applause). We cannot resolve this question ourselves. We do not have the capacities. Let us impose a print tax on publishing houses this year and provide the requisite number of textbooks. (Applause).

Comrades! A word about physical education. Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov spoke here with great pain in his heart. According to Ministry of Health data, 53 percent of schoolchildren are not good in terms of health. During education the number of healthy children drops by a factor of 3-4. This is a calamity. We are not entitled to ignore this and not point it out! That is why something must be done here. One component of this is physical training. But once again physical training must not occur through school alone. I believe that we must provide daily physical training classes at school, training that does not require stadiums and swimming pools. Look at any really cultured person: He devotes 1 hour per day to physical training without fail!

I think that there is only one way to ensure the success of all these transformations. It is the standard way for our time and for the country: democratization. Schools must be emancipated. Schools are diverse in our country and the main collective of teachers are enthusiasts, professionals, profoundly moral people who devote themselves wholly to the cause of education and instruction. We must allow them to act as they see fit. But while permitting them to act as they see fit, we must, of course, profess the medical principle: Don't do any harm! If you have any doubts, act in the old way. If you don't have any doubts that you can do better, act in the new way. Administrative control from above must be relaxed and control from below stepped up.

So now I come to the conclusion that the school council should be the main organ, a school council elected by the teachers by a secret ballot. Perhaps one-fourth should be elected in this way and another one-fourth of the council elected by pupils, either from the senior classes or from those 14-years-old and older. A number of parents and representatives of enterprises and organizations closely linked to the school must be sent to it. This council must be given the rights and the power to remove the director and dismiss teachers. It must have the power not to allow

the director to be dismissed or teachers to be dismissed and the power to control the budget. It must be founded on cooperative principles. Such a council must begin to work and take on all rights.

I believe that there must be a council of public education workers, apart from the school councils, who would also be elected democratically at our August conferences. It will deal with matters at the regional level.

The leaders of collectives have now been given broad rights. They make scant use of them, do not know how to enjoy them, and are afraid. Regulations relating to schools and educational establishments must be created so that leaders are not afraid, so that these regulations protect educational establishments against any kind of arbitrary action.

The drafts of such documents are being elaborated and we will make them public in August. We will discuss them at the August conferences and the congress of public education workers. I think that this is a most important moment. We are incorporating these principles in the work of the State Committee on Public Education. From this viewpoint I was delighted by the speech given by Academician Anatoliy Alekseyevich Logunov, who said that he does not need the committee. We want individuals to not need the committee, we are not a "we'll do your job for you" organization or an organization investigating "incorrect" and personal matters. The committee must undertake only those questions which cannot be resolved without it. These are questions related to the concept of continuous education, the dynamic development of education, questions on the content of education, textbooks, and continuity in all stages of the system. Therefore, we propose the election of a council at the public education workers congress, a council which we will assemble twice a year to really consult with on our most topical questions. That is in the spirit of democracy. (Applause).

Comrades! Education, enlightenment, instruction, school, and VUZ's—these are our concerns and our current anguish. The fate of the country depends on this. Pooling all our efforts will determine the fate of restructuring and the fate of the people. (Applause).

Rostov Chief Volodin's Speech

LD0107172088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Speech by Boris Mikhaylovich Volodin, first secretary of Rostov Obkom, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 1 July—recorded]

[Text] In our view, the enhancement of the role of the soviets of people's deputies is unthinkable without an improvement in the structure of the party bodies. At present in the forming of elective party bodies, there is an ever more active broadening of the process of democratization. There is more glasnost, and electiveness is becoming the norm of party life. Here the positive changes can already be seen.

At the same time, the democratic element in the forming of the apparat of the elective bodies is scarcely noticeable. The apparat of the party committee is necessary: we can't do without it. But we must draw up a provision regulating its activities as regards staffing and define more clearly its responsibility to the elective bodies. Many communists have proposed that Communists ought to be sent to work in the party committee apparat only on the recommendation of the primary party organization. Some have expressed the wish that we should define and embody in law the limitation of terms of office in the party apparat and the limits to the terms of officials in the elective party bodies. Otherwise, comrades, we have the paradox that the elective body is replaced by a new one, but the style and methods of its work often remain the same, because the apparat recommends or at times even dictates to the elective body how to act in various situations.

The idea was expressed in the report that, in order to ensure a steady flow of fresh forces, it would be desirable to provide for the possibility of a partial renewal of the Central Committee membership in the period between congresses. We fully share that thesis and would ask the conference to give permission to the obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms in the period between conferences [as heard] to act in the same way as regards renewing the membership of the party committees. In our opinion there is no need to tolerate, until the termination of the powers of the elective body, a leader who is not coping with the duties laid upon him. To envisage 5 years as the period of necessary cadre changes is practically impossible.

Comrades, I do not share the view point that has been expressed here, that coopting is bad. Practical experience suggests that reliance solely on local cadres often leads to parochialism, stagnation, and mutual guarantee. Of course, if it's possible to find a worthy successor from among the reserve, then that certainly mustn't on any account be neglected. But at the same time we must not hesitate to invite someone from outside when necessary, as it often is when senior officials, especially first secretaries, remain for a long time at the helm of the oblast, city, or rayon. We are unanimously of the opinion that the terms of office of leading party officials must be limited to two convocations. We fully concur in the report's thesis that permanent presidiums of the soviets, and also chairmen of the soviets, should be elected to the organs of power, except those of the rural areas and settlements. We have consulted with our delegation, representing 332,000 Rostov Communists, and we consider it right to recommend for those posts the first secretaries from the raykoms to the Central Committee. This would enhance the role of the representative organs of the soviets of people's deputies.

Volodin Speech Published

PM0307145388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 9-10

[Speech by B.M. Volodin, first secretary of Rostov party obkom, at 1 July afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades! The tremendous interest in our conference is natural. People are fed up with half-truths. They have been told from the platform and informed by the mass media that things in our country are going well and we have quite good living standards, while goods have vanished from store shelves and even items that just recently were in no demand at all are now in short supply. The plans for commissioning housing were overfulfilled, but the waiting lists for housing lengthened. And the atmosphere that emerged in the country after the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which outlined a breakthrough for the better in society's life, has inspired hopes that are developing into certainty that everything can be remedied provided that our party and our whole people tackle the matter in real earnest.

At meetings in labor collectives we were all given instructions, and our delegation in particular, not to stop halfway but to conduct restructuring in breadth and in depth. And that is what we are trying to do, comrades.

Comrades, the question of improving the political leadership of the party, state, and social organizations, and above all the soviets of people's deputies, was raised more often than ever before during the process of discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses.

On the eve of the conference we held a meeting with representatives of the oblast's labor collective councils. The meeting showed that these self-management organs accord with the spirit of the time and have a real influence on labor collectives, but unfortunately a mechanism for their relations with the soviets of people's deputies has not yet been worked out. There are already cases of "cross-purposes," of a failure to realize that they have common interests, although labor collective councils were set up only recently, and indeed have not been set up everywhere.

Proposals were voiced for subordinating these self-management organs to the soviets of people's deputies, especially with regard to the social development of territories. Otherwise, comrades, there is a contradiction: The soviet of people's deputies is ostensibly the sovereign master on its territory, but the enterprise—that is, part of that territory—for some reason does not want to find a common language with its master.

In our view, the enhancement of the role of the soviets of people's deputies is inconceivable without an improvement in the structure of party organs. At the present time the process of democratization is expanding increasingly vigorously in the formation of elected party organs, there is more glasnost, and election has begun to become the norm in party life. Positive changes are already visible here. At the same time democratic principles in forming the apparatus of elected organs are scarcely to be seen. The party committee apparatus is necessary, you cannot manage without it, but we must formulate statutes regulating its activity and the procedure for staffing it and more clearly define its responsibility to the elected organ.

Many Communists have voiced proposals that Communists should be assigned to work in the party committee apparatus only upon the recommendation of primary party organizations. Wishes were expressed that limitations on periods of office in the apparatus similar to those proposed for the personnel of elected party organs be defined and given legal form. Otherwise the result will be a paradox: The elected organ changes, but its style and methods of work often remain the same, since the apparatus recommends, and sometimes simply dictates, to elected organs how they should act in a particular situation. The report expressed the idea that it is expedient to envisage the possibility of partially renewing the membership of the Central Committee in the period between congresses in order to ensure a constant influx of new forces. We totally share this proposition and would ask the conference to authorize party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms to do likewise with regard to renewing the membership of party committees in the period between conferences. In our opinion, there is no need to tolerate a leader who fails to cope with his assigned duties for the entire period of the powers of an elected organ, and it is virtually impossible to make 5-year forecasts of the necessary cadre changes.

Comrades, I do not share the viewpoint that has been expressed here regarding the harmfulness of cooption. Practice suggests that reliance on local cadres alone often leads to parochialism, stagnation, and mutual protection. Of course, if it's possible to find a worthy replacement from among the reserve, this must in no way be ignored. But at the same time there must be no inhibition about inviting in an "outsider" if necessary. This need often arises where leading personnel, especially first secretaries, have been at the helm of an oblast, city, or rayon for a long time. And we are unanimous that the tenure of leading party office must be restricted to just two terms. We totally support the proposition made in the report that organs of soviet power, apart from rural and settlement soviets, elect permanent soviet presidiums and soviet chairmen. We have consulted with our delegation, which represents the 332,000 Communists of Rostov Oblast here, and have decided to totally support the proposals that first secretaries, from raykoms to the Central Committee, be recommended for these posts. This would enhance the role of the representative organs of the soviets of people's deputies.

Comrades, a great deal has already been said here about the work of the mass media. Essentially it is hard for me to say anything new. The mass media are certainly

carrying out enormous work, are awakening public opinion, and have become very popular among the population.

But, as a number of speeches here have pointed out, there are still a great many problems in their activity. I would like to draw your attention to one of them: the undiscriminating selecion of authors. For instance, in issues 1 and 2 of OGONEK a certain Soyfer castigates Lysenkoism, and in issue 12 the magazine acquaints us with the author of the article himself. It turns out that he is prepared to offer advice from abroad—to which he deserted, abandoning the motherland—on how we should act in particular cases and stuations. What is the magazine doing? Indeed, the problem that has been raised is important, but, comrades, was there truly no one in the country, no author, who could really raise this problem in OGONEK?

In this connection it would not be superfluous to remind certain comrades of the following historical fact. In 1922 the All-Union Central Executive Committee's newspaper, IZVESTIYA, published an account of the content of a pamphlet by Parvus. In this connection Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote in a memorandum to the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) Central Committee Politburo: "I propose that an investigation be set up into who was responsible for newspapers carrying a dispatch containing an account of Parvus' writings the other day. When the culprit has been identified, I propose that the chief of that section of the ROSTA [Russian Telegraph Agency] be strictly reprimanded and that the journalist directly responsible be dismissed, for only a total fool or a White Guard could turn our newspapers into an instrument for publicity for a scoundrel like Parvus." (Applause)

Comrades! It should also be remembered that our newspapers must be organizers. And not only when it is necessary to criticize someone together, but also when it is necessary to speak of burgeoning innovations and to organize their dissemination. In general there is not much of this in our newspapers.

I think that the mass news media require a precise legal basis. I support the proposal that has been voiced here—there is a need for a law guaranteeing both their rights and responsibility for the objectivity of their statements.

Comrades! Our conference is to adopt historically important decisions. Some people are demanding clarifications of the CPSU Statutes and the USSR Constitution. They are in force. We do not think that we should start resolving the question only when the "ugly duckling" has developed into a beautiful swan, as certain comrades have proposed here in their speeches. Incidentally, they themselves did not specify when this would be. Therefore we propose that the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium be given the right to make the decisions now required by the cause and by restructuring, especially on questions of improving party leadership of state and social organizations. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

Yeltsin Asks for Rehabilitation

LD0107110188 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—Boris Yeltsin asked the delegates of the 19th party conference for his "political rehabilitation."

The last speaker to take the floor at the forum's noon session today, he set forth his position on a number of aspects of perestroyka.

After his speech a break was announced at the conference.

On the demand of a number of delegates Boris Yeltsin replied in detail to questions concerning his interviews to a number of foreign television companies. He said in particular that long before the requests from foreign media outlets he had given interviews to representatives of the NOVOSTI press agency and the magazine OGONEK which, however, were not published.

The speaker said further that the American CBS television company had distorted the text of his interview. CBS, Yeltsin said, had formally apoligised to him for this.

A number of questions from delegates concerned Yeltsin's speech at the organisational plenary meeting of the Moscow City Party Committee. Yeltsin said that the incoherence of his speech there was due to his very sick state.

The very period of preparation for the conference, Yelstin said further, has evoked an exceptional interest and hopes of Communists, all Soviet people. Perestroyka has injected vigour in the people.

Yet, he went on, the preparations for the conference were conducted in haste. The Theses of the Central Committee were published late. Even the majority of members of the Central Committee were not drawn extensively enough into the drafting of the Theses. The election of delegates in a number of organisations followed old patterns, he said further.

But the discussion at the conference itself, he said, is proceeded in an interesting manner. This will be reflected in the decisions that are to be adopted.

The delegate then made some comments and suggestions concerning the Central Committee Theses with account of Mikhail Gorbachev's report.

He believes that the main thing is to fashion such a mechanism in the party and society that would rule out the mistakes of the past, which have hurled the country decades back, and create a system of genuine popular government and solid guarantees to ensure it.

Yeltsin made proposals regarding the combining of the functions or the leaders of party committees and governing councils, or soviets, and democratization in the system of elections in the party and the state. Many of those proposals concurred with those earlier voiced by other speakers.

"Our party and society as a whole have grown mature enough to be trusted to decide such matters on their own and perestroyka only stands to gain from it," the delegate said.

He stressed that Leonid Brezhnev is not the only one to blame for the stagnation of the past, and criticized the Central Committee apparatus for having failed to break many negative trends in the party and society in time.

Yeltsin raised the issue of the personal accountability of those leaders who, in his opinion, have been responsible for this.

He pointed to democratization and openness as a guarantee that this will never recur again. This conference, he said, is perhaps the first exception where communists do not bypass any "zone" with their criticisms.

The speaker expressed agreement witht he proposal made in Gorbachev's report for creating regional commissions from among Central Committee members, without whose participation and consent no party resolution of principled significance will be adopted.

Perestroyka, Yeltsin said, has so far been going with much difficulty, which means that "everyone of us is not putting in enough effort, is not struggling hard enough for it".

"The party exists for the people, and the people should know everything it does." The delegate suggested specific steps towards greater openness in all spheres of life in the CPSU, including the activity of the Party Central Committee.

His remarks, like many other statements made at the conference, touched upon problems of social justice. Yeltsin observed that they had been resolved on the whole. But some issues remained unresolved which decreased the prestige of the party among the people, the speaker said.

The delegate expressed his view on methods and scope of reducing the party apparatus and consolidating the soviets (local governing councils). He suggested adopting a separate resolution on youth.

Yeltsin addressed the conference with a request for his "political rehabilitation."

"I believe that this is a principled issue, appropriate in the light of the socialist pluralism of views, freedom of criticism, tolerance towards the opponent, proclaimed in the report and statements by delegates," he said.

"As you know, my speech at the October, 1987 plenary meeting of the Central Committee was announced politically erroneous.

"I believe that my only mistake was that I chose the wrong time, before the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the revolution.

"I took very much to heart what happened. I ask the conference to review the plenum's decision on this issue.

"If you find this possible, you will thus rehabilitate me in the eyes of the Communists."

Yeltsin Addresses Conference

LD0107182388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1612 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Yeltsin, delegate to the conference, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy of the USSR Gosstroy, took the floor [at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 1 July].

[Begin recording] [Yeltsin] I would like to express some views and proposals concerning the Central Committee Theses, taking into account Comrade Gorbachev's report.

On the political system: I believe that the main thing here is that such a mechanism should operate in the party and society which would prevent the errors even remotely similar to those we knew in the past which set the country decades back; a mechanism which would not breed great leaders and the great leader syndrome [vozhdi i vozhdizm]. One has to create true sovereignty of the people and give firm guarantees of that.

Here are some proposals concerning elections. They must be universal, direct and by secret ballot, including the elections of secretaries and the general secretary of the Central Committee, from the bottom to top, and from members of oblast bureaus or from the Politburo, which should also be elected by all Communists. Thus there will be two rounds of elections. This should apply also to the Supreme Soviet, trade unions, and the Komsomol. Without any exceptions, particularly for the upper echelon, the period of service in the elective office should be limited to two terms. People could be elected for the second term only if there are tangible results of their work during the previous term. Clear-cut age limits of 65 should be introduced for time spent in those organs, including the Politburo. The previous elections should be taken as a point of reference for counting

terms in office, and age limits should be counted as of this year. Our party and society as a whole have become mature enough to be entrusted with the task of solving such questions independently, and restructuring will only profit by this.

One can agree with the proposal contained in the report on setting up commissions in charge of specific spheres, formed of Central Committee members, so that not a single fundamental decision by the party Central Committee should be adopted without being examined and approved by them. Whereas now decisions are adopted not by the Central Committee but by its apparatus, and many of them are still-born. Large-scale drafts should be discussed by the whole party and the country, and referendums should be used. Joint decisions by the Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers should be out of the question, as a rule.

In implementing restructuring, goals should be mapped out not only up to the year 2000—now many people are not interested to know what they will earn then, if at all. But one or two tasks aimed at people's benefit should be laid down and solved once and for all, without trying to do everything at once and at the expense of other areas. One should concentrate everything, resources, science, people's energies, and so forth on precisely that.

The party is for the people, and the people must know all it does. Unfortunately, this is not the case. There must be detailed reports by the Politburo and the Secretariat, excluding questions containing state secrets. Also one must know leaders' biographies and present-day lives, what their responsibilities are, what their salaries are, what results each leader from the upper echelon achieves in his field. There are such forbidden secrets and subjects like financial issues or the party budget. The charter says: The CPSU Central Committee determines how to spend funds. That is, not the apparatus but the Central Committee.

However such questions were not discussed at the plenum. I propose making this compulsory in the future because party money is being spent on this, and that means hundreds of millions of roubles, unbeknown to Central Committee members and even less so to other Communists. The Auditing Commission does not report this at the congress and proposes reducing the obkom apparatus by between one half and two thirds and reviewing the Central Committee 6, 8, or 10 times, eliminating the sector departments.

Comrade delegates, a tricky issue... [disturbances in the hall]

[Gorbachev] Say what you have to say, Boris Nikolayevich.

[Yeltsin] I only wanted to address the matter of politically rehabilitating myself, personally, after the Central Committee October plenum. If you think the times no longer permit this, than that's all there is to it. [sounds of disapproval in the hall]

[Gorbachev] Boris Nikolayevich, just say it. [more disturbance, then applause] Let's, I think, remove the mystery from the Yeltsin affair. Let Boris Nikolayevich say everything he believes he should say, and if something occurs to us to say, then that can be said too. Boris Nikolayevich, please.

[Yeltsin] Comrade Delegates, rehabilitation 50 years on has now become a commonplace, and this has a good effect on the normalization of society. But I personally am asking for political rehabilitation at least while I'm still alive. I believe this is a fundamental and appropriate matter in the light of the socialist pluralism of opinions, freedom of criticism, and tolerance of an opponent proclaimed in the report and the speeches.

You know that my speech at the Central Committee October plenum was acknowledged politically erroneous by a decision of the plenum. I believe that the only error in that speech was that I spoke at the wrong time and before the 70th anniversary of October. Evidentally, we all need to have mastered the rules of political debate and to tolerate the views of opponents as Lenin did without immediately attributing labels and regarding them as heretics.

Comrade delegates, the issues I raised at the Central Committee October plenum have been fully reflected in the speeches at the conference and in my own speech. I am very hurt by what has happened and request that the conference revoke the decision of the plenum on this matter. [end recording]

Yeltsin Speech Published

PM0207121088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 10

[Speech by B.N. Yeltsin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosstroy and USSR minister, at 1 July afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! First of all, I must answer the demands of delegate Comrade Zagaynov, who has spoken here, on a number of questions.

The first question. Why did I give an interview to foreign television companies, and not to the Soviet press? I will answer. First of all, APN approached me, and I gave an interview, long before the television companies. But that interview was not published in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI.

Later APN approached me a second time, but again there was no guarantee, so to speak, that the interview would be published. The editorial office of the magazine

OGONEK asked me for an interview before that. I gave a 2-hour interview, but that interview was not published, although 6 weeks elapsed. According to Comrade Korotich, you see, it was not permitted.

The next question. Why did I speak so "inarticulately" at the Moscow gorkom organizational plenum? I will answer. I was seriously ill, confined to bed, without the right, without the possibility of getting out of bed. An hour and a half before the plenum I was summoned to the plenum, and so the doctors pumped me full of drugs. And I sat at that plenum unable to feel anything, and in effect even less able to speak.

Next. I receive a letter from the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting with an explanation and a request that in connection with the conference, they have been instructed to coordinate interviews given to foreign television companies by our leaders, and that they are asking me to give interviews to a number of them.

By then, 15 such requests had accumulated. I told Comrade Kravchenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, that for reasons of time I could give only two or three interviews, no more. After that, there was a telephone message from the committee saying that three television companies, the BBC, CBS, and ABC, were stipulated. So I fixed a time and gave an interview to these three companies in my office. The questions and answers were immediate. I resolutely rebuffed any discourteous questions that would have been detrimental in any way to our state or party or their prestige.

Then there were questions about Comrade Ligachev. I said that I have the same views in strategic terms, on the congress decisions, the tasks of restructuring, and so forth. He and I have certain differences of views on the tactics of restructuring and on questions of social justice and his work style. I did not go into detail. There was also this question: "Do you think that if someone else was in Comrade Ligachev's place, restructuring would proceed more rapidly?" I answered: "Yes." After distorting what I said, CBS television (United States) carried my refutation and sent me a written apology for the error signed by the deputy president of the company.

Then Comrade Solomentsev summoned me and demanded an explanation. I expressed my indignation at being summoned on such a matter and replied verbally to every question asked about the interview. The attempt to find an offense on my part against the Statutes failed. I consider myself entirely blameless in this matter. A tape containing a complete recording was handed over to Comrade Solomentsev by our interpreter. I do not know what you will do with me next, but this is very reminiscent of the shadow of the recent, not too distant past.

Now for my speech.

Comrade delegates! The main issue for the conference as it was conceived is democratization in the party, bearing in mind that with time it has changed drastically for the worse. And, of course, the discussion of today's burning issues of restructuring and the revolutionary renewal of society in general. The period of preparations for the conference itself aroused exceptional interest and hopes among Communists and all Soviet people. Restructuring has roused the people. And evidently restructuring should have started with the party. Then it would have led everyone else in its wake, as always. But the party, precisely from the viewpoint of restructuring, fell behind. That means that today's conference should have been held considerably earlier. That is my personal view.

But even now, the preparations have been rather hasty. The Theses were published late in the day and the Central Committee apparatus drew them up. They did not include the most important thing that appeared in the report about the political system. Even the majority of Central Committee members were not widely involved in drafting the Theses. It will not, of course, be possible to take into account in our conference decisions all the proposals that have been submitted, that whole mine of the people's wisdom.

The elections of delegates, despite Comrade R. Yazumov's attempt in PRAVDA to convince everyone that they were democratic, were nonetheless carried out in a number of organizations according to the old patterns, showing that the apparatus in the top echelon is not restructuring itself.

But the discussion at the conference itself is interesting. And now the main thing is, what kind of decisions will be adopted? Will they satisfy the country's Communists and society as a whole? Judging by the 1st day, the impression was very cautious, I would even say depressing. But every day the heat is rising, and it is becoming more and more interesting to listen to the delegates, and this will obviously be reflected in the decisions adopted.

I would also like to make a few observations and proposals on the Central Committee Theses, in the light of Comrade Gorbachev's report.

On the political system. Here I consider the most important thing is for a mechanism to operate in the party and society that would preclude errors even closely resembling those of the past, which put the country back by decades, prevent the emergence of "great leaders" ["vozhdi"] and "leadership cults" ["vozhdizm"], and create true people's power and provide firm guarantees of that.

The report's proposal on combining the functions of first secretaries of party committees and soviet organs was so unexpected for the delegates that a worker here said in his speech that "he cannot understand it yet." As a minister, I would say: Nor can I. Time is needed to

comprehend it. It is too complex a matter. And then I, for instance, propose the holding of a nationwide referendum on this question. (Applause.)

Some proposals about elections: They should be general, direct, and secret, and that includes elections of secretaries and the Central Committee general secretary, from top to bottom, from among the oblast bureaus or the Politburo, which should also be elected by all the Communists by the same means (making two rounds of elections). That should also apply to the Supreme Soviet, the trade unions, and the Komsomol. Tenure in an elected post to be limited to two terms, with no exceptions, least of all for the top echelon. Election for a second term to take place only on the basis of real results of work in the previous period. Strict age limits of 65 to be introduced for membership of these organs, including the Politburo. The term of office to be reckoned from the previous election, and age—from the current year. Our party and society as a whole have matured sufficiently to be entrusted with resolving such questions independently, and restructuring can only gain from it.

Everything that has been said, and not the two-party system that some people have proposed, will, in my opinion, be some guarantee against a personality cult, which does not set in after 10-15 years, but is born immediately if the basis for it exists. I think we should guard against this now, because the neglect of Leninist norms in the past years has already done the people so much harm. There should be tough barriers, established by the Statutes or by law.

In a number of countries there is an established procedure: When the leader goes, the leadership goes. In our country we are used to blaming the dead for everything. Especially since they will not hit back. Now it turns out that Brezhnev alone was to blame for stagnation. But where were those who were in the Politburo then, for 10, 15, or 20 years, and are still there? They voted for the various programs every time. Why were they silent when one man, on the say-so of the Central Committee apparatus, was deciding the fate of the party, the country, socialism? They kept on voting until one man had five stars [Orders of Lenin] and society as a whole was in crisis. Why did they appoint the sick Chernenko? Why was the Party Control Committee, while punishing relatively small deviations from the norms of party life, afraid—and it is still afraid—to take proceedings against major leaders of republics and oblasts for bribe-taking, for damage to the state amounting to millions, and so forth? While certainly knowing about some of them. It must be said that this liberalism on the part of Comrade Solomentsev toward bribe-taking millionaires causes some concern.

I believe that certain Politburo members, guilty as members of a collective organ who are endowed with the trust of the Central Committee and the party, should answer: Why were the country and party reduced to such a state? And after that, conclusions should be drawn—they should be removed from the Politburo. (Applause.) That is a more humane step than to criticize people posthumously and then move them to a different grave!

The following procedure is proposed for the future: If the general secretary changes, the Politburo is renewed, except for those who have joined it recently; the Central Committee apparatus is also renewed in the main. Then people will not be caught in a permanent administrative trap. Then people will not criticize others only after their death, because they will know that everyone, including every elected organ, has to answer to the party.

And another thing. Although the general secretary has stated clearly that we now have no zones or leaders—himself included—that are beyond criticism, in practice it turns out differently. There is a zone, a line, above which the very first attempt to criticize is followed by an instant warning, "Hands Off!" So it turns out that even Central Committee members are afraid to express their personal opinion if it differs from the report, or to speak out against the leadership.

That does the greatest damage, distorts the party conscience and the personality, and schools us on every proposal—"the opinion is"—to immediately raise our hands: all those in favor. The present conference is probably the first exception to this, which has become the rule. It still happens that a policy pursued by the leading organs basically remains incontrovertible, is still outside criticism, outside the control of the people's masses, even today.

One has to agree with the report's proposal on setting up commissions on specific spheres, made up of Central Committee members, without whose consideration and consent no major party Central Committee resolution would be adopted. At present a resolution basically comes not from the Central Committee, but from its apparatus, and many of them immediately become stillborn. Major drafts should be discussed by the whole party and country, and referendums should be the practice. As a rule, joint resolutions of the Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers should be abolished.

Yes, we are proud of socialism and proud of what has been done, but we must not plume ourselves on it. After all, in 70 years we have not resolved the main questions—feeding and clothing the people, establishing the service sphere, resolving social questions. That is the aim of the restructuring of society, but it is proceeding with great delays, which means that every one of us is not working hard enough and not fighting for it enough. But also, one of the main reasons for the difficulties in restructuring is its declarative nature. It was proclaimed without sufficient analysis of the causes of the stagnation that had occurred, analysis of the present-day situation in society, without profound analysis in a historical context of the errors and omissions made by the party.

And as a result of restructuring, in 3 years we have not resolved any really tangible problems for people, still less have we achieved revolutionary transformations.

In implementing restructuring we should not only set targets for the year 2000 (many people today are not interested in what they may or may not be getting then), we should set one or two tasks for people's benefit for every 2-3 years, and finally resolve them. Rather than trying to do everything at once, at the expense of other areas, we should concentrate everything on these tasks—resources, science, people's energy, and so forth. Then, with a greatly increased faith that the restructuring of society is in progress, that it is producing results, and that it is irreversible, people will tackle other problems considerably more rapidly. At present, people's faith could totter at any moment. Until now, everyone has been hypnotized by words—that has saved us. In the future, there is a risk of losing the helm of government and political stability.

And now, about openness in the party. Diversity of opinions should be a normal phenomenon in the party (after all, it is not a question of standardization). And the existence of a different minority opinion will not destroy the party's unity, it will strengthen it. The party is for the people, and the people should know everything it does. That, unfortunately, is not the case. There should be detailed reports from the Politburo and Secretariat (apart from matters concerning state secrets), and people should know about the lives and careers of leaders, what they do, how much they earn, and what results each leader in the top echelon obtains in his sector of work. This also means regular television appearances, the results of admission to the party, summaries of working people's letters to the Central Committee, and so forth. In general, there should be a whole party sociology about the moral health of party and state leaders. This should be open to everyone, not secret.

There are also "banned," "secret" topics, such as questions of party budget finances. The Statutes say: "...how finances are spent is determined by the CPSU Central Committee," that is, not the apparatus, but the Central Committee. But such matters have not been discussed at plenums. In future I propose that this should be done without fail, since where the party money goes (and it amounts to hundreds of millions of rubles) is not known to Central Committee members, nor, of course, to other Communists. The auditing commission does not report on it to the congress, and apparently it does not have access to the till.

I know, for instance, how many milions are paid over to the Central Committee from Moscow City and Sverdlovsk Oblast party organizations. But how the money is spent—I do not know. Only I see that, apart from rational spending, luxurious houses and dachas are built, and sanatoriums on such a scale that it is embarrassing when representatives of other parties go there. Yet that money should be used to give material support to primary party organizations, including their leaders' wages. And then we are surprised when certain major party leaders are up to their eyes in corruption, bribes, and overreporting and have lost their decency, moral purity, modesty, and sense of party comradeship.

In the Brezhnev period the degeneration of the top strata covered many regions, and this must not be underestimated or oversimplified. The rot is clearly deeper than some people suppose, and the mafia, I know from Moscow, definitely exists.

Questions of social justice. Of course, in broad terms, on socialist principles, they have been resolved in our country. But certain questions remain which have not been resolved, which arouse people's indignation, lower the party's prestige, and have a pernicious effect on the pace of restructuring.

My opinion is that this is what should happen: If we lack something here, in the socialist society, the shortage should be felt to an equal degree by everyone, without exception. (Applause.) And different labor contributions to society should be regulated by different wages. We must, of course, abolish the food "rations" for the, so to speak, "starving nomenklatura," eradicate elitism in society, eradicate the substance and the form of the word "special" ["spets"] from our vocabulary, since we do not have any special Communists.

I think this will help party workers greatly in working with people, it will help restructuring.

The structure and reduction of the party apparatus. Lenin's slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" will not be put into practice with such a mighty party apparatus. I propose cutting the apparatus to half or one-third in the obkoms, and to between one-sixth and one-tenth in the Central Committee, with the elimination of sector departments.

I would like to speak about young people. There is virtually nothing about them in the Theses. The report says a great deal, and I would support the proposal to adopt a separate resolution on young people. It is not we, but they who are and will be assigned the main role in renewing our socialist society. We must be bold in training them to lead the processes at all levels, we must be bold in handing over whole strata of leadership at absolutely every level to young people.

Comrade delegates! A tricky matter. I only wanted to touch on the question of my personal political rehabilitation after the Central Committee October plenum. (Disturbance in the auditorium.) If you think time does not permit this, then that is all.

M.S. Gorbachev: Boris Nikolayevich, say it, please. (Applause.) I think we should remove the secrecy from the Yeltsin affair. Let Boris Nikolayevich say whatever he considers it necessary to say. And if something occurs to us, we can say it too. Please, Boris Nikolayevich.

B.N. Yeltsin: Comrade delegates! Rehabilitation after 50 years has now become the custom, and that has a good effect on the normalization of society. But I personally request political rehabilitation in my lifetime. I consider this question important and apposite in the light of the socialist pluralism of opinions, freedom of criticism, and tolerance of the opponent proclaimed in the report and in the speeches.

You know that my speech at the CPSU Central Committee October Plenum was deemed "politically erroneous" by a decision of the plenum. But the questions raised there, at the plenum, have been repeatedly raised in the press and posed by Communists. During these days, virtually all these questions have been raised from this platform in the report and in the speeches. I think my only mistake in my speech was that I spoke at the wrong time—just before the 70th anniversary of October.

Evidently we all have to master the rules of political debate, tolerate our opponents' opinion, as V.I. Lenin did, and not immediately pin labels on people and consider them heretics.

Comrade delegates! Both the speeches at the conference and my own speech have reflected in full the questions I raised at the CPSU Central Committee October (1987) Plenum. I feel what happened keenly, and I ask the conference to revoke the plenum's decision on this matter. If you consider it possible to revoke it, you will thereby rehabilitate me in the Communists' eyes. And this is not only a personal matter, it will be in the spirit of restructuring, it will be democratic and, I believe, it will help restructuring by increasing people's confidence.

Yes, the renewal of society is difficult. But progress, however small, is being made, and life itself obliges us to follow this path alone. (Applause.)

Gorbachev Chairs Session

LD0107134488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] The evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference has been continuing for 1 and ½ hours in the Kremlin, with Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the chair. Comrade Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar Obkom; Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU; Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee; and Pukhova, chairman of the Soviet Women's Committee, have already spoken at the session.

The chairman then gave the floor to Comrade Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Usmanov on Yeltsin Rehabilitation

LD0107162188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Speech by Gumer Usmanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Tatar Obkom, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 1 July—recorded]

[Text] I should like to refer to the issue which Comrade Yeltsin raised in his address. He incorporated the first part of this, relating to his speech at the October plenum, fully into his address today; namely, on the democratic nature of elections. Comrades, this issue was examined at our party's Central Committee June plenum. Boris Nikolayevich also took part in, spoke at, and voted at this plenum. He spoke about a lack of democracy in the process of electing delegates. But everyone sitting here will undoubtedly agree that we have never yet had such democratic elections. One cannot but agree that there was not enough time to discuss things more democratically and to go into things even more deeply. We will probably take account of this. This is the first time. Practice makes perfect.

Second: the delimitation of the functions for party, local soviet, and economic organs. This issue has been discussed in many addresses; disputes have arisen over this among our delegates, too. As we understand it, no one has any objections on the essence of the matter. What gives rise to doubt is whether first secretaries from the lowest to the higher echelons should be recommended for this work. Comrades, this is, after all, extra work for the secretaries. Mikhail Sergeyevich said that the structure of the party organs would be reexamined, that the party is equipping itself with the most democratic methods of leadership, so that we are swapping our first secretaries. Not everyone wants to assume this burden; it is not so simple, after all. Yet, when all is said and done, how can one imagine democratization, if the first secretary is always in the party apparatus and does not carry out this work through the legislative soviet organ?

Of course, this is all new. It always takes a while to grasp new things straight off. But, nevertheless, if we want to embark upon genuine democratization, we must agree with this. It really is like that, comrades. How can we, without working in the local soviets, concentrating all power in the party alone; that is, how can we democratize the process which has been proposed to us?

As regards the second part of Comrade Yeltsin's address: his political rehabilitation. All the members of the Central Committee who took part in the work of the October plenum are present here. Boris Nikolayevich said that the only mistake he made was to speak at the wrong time. Let's look at that again. It seems to me that he chose his

time quite deliberately. He not only delivered an address but also, declaring that he did not agree with the speed at which restructuring work was proceeding, asked to resign. Then Mikhail Sergeyevich turned to Boris Nikolayevich: Take your words back, summon up your strength, and continue to head the very big, prestigious Moscow party organization. But Boris Nikolayevich categorically refused, and, as you know, the Moscow party organization adopted its decision on this issue.

We hardly have grounds not to trust such a prestigious capital city party organization. That's the first thing I have to say. All the more so when he does not serve to promote the prestige of the party and our country by his actions and deeds, granting interviews right and left to various foreign agencies. He gets into print: he's working for his own prestige! [applause]

On behalf of our delegation, I therefore do not support his request for political rehabilitation.

Usmanov Speech Published

PM0307100088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 10

[Speech by G.I. Usmanov, first secretary of Tatar party obkom, at 1 July evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! You will understand, of course, that it is not easy for me to speak. The debates are taking place on the report of the CPSU Central Committee, which was delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The large-scale problems that were put forward made each of us think deeply. I am speaking as representative of the Tatar Oblast party organization, but as a member of the party Central Committee I must touch on a few questions that Comrade Yeltsin raised in his speech.

Its first section. Doubtless nobody has any objections in principle to his speech, ardent debates took place on this during the period of preparations for the conference. There have not been such open, heated debates about the state of affairs in the party and in society since Lenin's time. This spirit was created by the party, and no one else. I think it would be right for us to express our satisfaction over this. And many thanks to the Politburo and General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for their titanic work in improving the whole of our society and for the Central Committee April plenum. (Applause.)

Communists and working people in all regions gave all of us delegates a mandate not only to maintain this spirit, this mood, at the conference, but even to intensify it. The atmosphere prevailing in the conference auditorium of unprecedented openness and open discussion of crucial questions for the country gives us grounds to say that the conference delegates are fully determined to justify the lofty trust invested in them.

All the same, I would like to dwell on two points in the first part of Comrade Yeltsin's speech. As regards his speech at the CPSU Central Committee October (1987) Plenum, he incorporated it in full into his speech today. On the democratic nature of elections. This question was examined at the June (1987) plenum of our party's Central Committee. Boris Nikolayevich also took part, spoke, and voted at that plenum. He spoke here of insufficient democracy in the process of electing delegates. But everyone sitting in this auditorium will probably agree that we have never before had such democratic elections. One cannot but agree that there was not enough time to discuss them more democratically and go into even greater depth. We will bear that in mind.

Second. On the delimitation of the functions of party, soviet, and economic organs. This question has been touched on in many speeches and has prompted disputes among our delegates. As we understand it, no one has any objections on the substance of the matter. What gives rise to doubt is this—whether first secretaries, from the lowest to the highest echelon, should be recommended for this work. That means additional work for the secretary. Mikhail Sergeyevich said at the conference that the structure of party organs will be reviewed and that the party will take up the most democratic methods of leadership. We are exchanging opinions with the first secretaries about this: Not everyone is yet willing to take on this burden, it is not as easy as that. And I think that of course, this is something new, it cannot be grasped straight off, immediately, as quickly as that, but nonetheless, if we want to take the path of real democratization, we will have to agree to it. Really, it is like this, Comrades: Without working in the soviets, while adhering in practice to the principle "power for the party alone," how can we democratize the process?

As regards the second part of Comrade Yeltsin's speech, his political rehabilitation. All the Central Committee members who took part in the work of the October plenum are present here. Boris Nikolayevich has said here that the only mistake he made was to speak out at the wrong time.

Let us see, is this so? I do not think he chose his time by chance. He not only delivered his speech, he also stated that he does not agree with the pace of the work being done in restructuring, and asked to resign. Then Mikhail Sergeyevich turned to him and said to him with fatherly warmth: Boris, he said, take back your words, summon your strength, and continue to head the very big, prestigious Moscow party organization. But Boris Nikolayevich categorically refused. And as you know, the Moscow party organization made its decision on this matter. We have no grounds to distrust the capital's prestigious party organization. Especially since with his deeds and actions Yeltsin is not working for the prestige of the party and our country, by giving interviews right, left, and center to various foreign agencies. They publish him, he is working for his own prestige. (Applause.)

Therefore on behalf of our delegation, I do not support his request for political rehabilitation. Wherever we work, we have one most serious duty: in every way to strengthen the unity and cohesion of our party—the guarantee of success, our cementing force. (Applause.)

Comrades! The conference delegates have expressed through their clapping their attitude to the results of work achieved since the Central Committee April plenum referred to by the speakers. We take this clapping to mean that we are not entirely satisfied with what has been achieved, although some changes for the better are taking place. In this connection it must be said that the potential inherent in the economic reform is as yet being realized only feebly. A mechanism to ensure the full autonomy of enterprises has not yet been set up. Even the most energetic champions of restructuring cannot overcome the bureaucratic obstacles in the path of the introduction of the new economic mechanism.

This was spoken of impressively by Comrade Kabaidze, whom we consider one of the foremost champions of restructuring in our country. Unfortunately, in the regions we have few such people as Vladimir Pavlovich. If things are difficult even for them, we must take a closer look: What is the problem? Why does the existing practice of formulating state orders and economic norms that conceal under a new cover the old administrative diktat, run counter to the spirit and the letter of the Law on the State Enterprise, not allow the eradication of wage-leveling and the notorious gross output, fail to provide guidelines for the industrial consumer, and fail to create conditions for competitiveness and the switch to wholesale trade? Comrades, we must resolve these questions without delay, even if they cause our figures to deteriorate for a time, and create the conditions for normal work by the labor collectives. Then we will see clearly who is already able to work in the new conditions, who needs to be taught, and whom we should get rid of. If that is not done, we will go on for a long time looking for the abstract enemy of restructuring, there will be a great deal of noise, but the results are hardly likely to satisfy us. (Applause.)

Comrades! Our party is at present, in all its multifaceted activity, reviving the revolutionary spirit of criticism both in evaluating the past and in analyzing contemporary phenomena and processes. It has courageously taken the initiative and assumed tremendous historical responsibility for the country's fate. And it is doing this work. (Applause.)

We realize that after the conference, returning to our places, we will all have much work to do. Things will doubtless be considerably hotter than before. We wish you all great successes in implementing the most noble ideals and the decisions our conference will take today. Thank you for your attention. (Applause.)

AUCCTU's Shalayev Speaks

PM0407180588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 88 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, at 1 July evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! The main aim of my speech above all is to state the attitude of the country's trade unions toward the exceptionally important questions we are discussing at the 4th day of this conference. The trade unions, one of the key components in our society's political system and a buttress for the party in the masses, do not merely support the outlined measures to deepen the process of restructuring and to reform the political system. They see their own place, their own specific tasks, and their growing responsibility in this process to ensure the active participation in restructuring of all working people and all members of our organization, and to ensure their growing initiative and conscious attitude to labor and a broader application of the practice of self-management, democratization, and glasnost.

We appreciate the importance of the propositions in the report concerning the enhancement of the role of trade unions, their direct representation in supreme organs of Soviet power, the transfer of certain functions previously carried out by state organs to trade unions and other public organizations, and a number of other measures. We accept them as—I would say—serious support from the party. We welcome these measures. The proposition defining a strong social policy as one of the main priorities of the future activities of the party is of special political importance to us and all working people. Allow me, in this context, to express a number of fundamental considerations.

We all realize that it will be possible to truly revive labor and sociopolitical life and the activeness of the masses, and on this basis accelerate the development of the economy, only when Soviet people actually feel the results of restructuring and a strong social policy on their own living standards. Of course, much will depend on the successful implementation of the economic reform, on the organizational work of party, economic, soviet, and public organizations, and on the results of the economic activity of the labor collectives themselves. However, the radical reorientation of our economy toward the solution of social issues, beginning with planning—since it is now in planning in particular that the principle of the residual approach to social development is particularly deeply rooted—will unquestionably be decisive.

During the 15 years from 1971 to 1985, the amount of national income channeled into consumption totaled an average of only just over 73 percent. Over the past 2 years it has risen somewhat. At present, however, central economic organs and many leading economists and

advisers discussing the long-term socioeconomic development of our country are again proposing that the share of the consumption fund should be reduced. Some are seeking a reduction of this indicator to 70 percent. Yet each percentage point represents around R6 billion, which could be taken out of the social "purse," out of the social consumption funds.

What can be said about this case of intensification of social policy? The experience and the practice of many countries with developed economies, capitalist and socialist countries, including the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and a number of others, indicate that it is possible to channel more than 80 percent of the national income into consumption without detracting from the expansion of reproduction. Our country has the potential to do this, and an acute need to do it. Comrades Chazov, Fedotov, Yarin, and others have already spoken about this. In addition to ensuring a higher growth rate of national income, there is an acute need to resolutely review the structure of national income with a view to achieving—as the AUCCTU has proposed repeatedly—a marked shift toward increasing the share of national income allocated to consumption, raising it to a minimum of 78 to 80 percent, and simultaneously increasing the expenditure for sociocultural construction. This is even more possible now that—thanks to the active foreign policy of our party—progress has been achieved and is being developed in the relaxation of international tension and disarmament, and where specific improvements have emerged in the country's investment policy. I would like to emphasize once again: Unless we resolve this fundamental question, we will not be able to resolve the pressing tasks of raising the people's living standards, as we have been discussing at this conference, of improving pensions, health care, education, and so forth. In other words, we will not be able to make a strong social policy really strong. (more)

The problem of the serious lag in the production of group "B" consumer goods in our country, where even the clearly inadequate growth rate indicators laid down for the current 5-year plan are not being met, has to be viewed in the context of the first question.

Tell me, can there be any justification for the fact that during the more than 40 years since the war our planned socialist economy has proved unable to resolve this problem? Despite the comprehensive all-union program and regional and sectorial programs for developing the production of consumer goods and the service sphere, we have been and continue to be unable to produce enough consumer goods of the right quality. I will be so bold as to claim that unless we all—beginning with the USSR Gosplan, the government of the country, and the governments of the union republics—change our attitude to this matter, unless we markedly reorientate all our industrial production toward satisfying the population's demand for consumer goods and services, making full use of the economic relations, stimuli, and advantages of the planned socialist economy, production sharing, and all other reserves of our national economy, we will not succeed.

According to our estimates, the production of consumer goods, in addition to a substantial expansion of services, must be increased to at least 35 percent of the total volume of industrial production as early as the next 5-year plan, as opposed to current 25 percent level. For the sake of comparison I would like to say that in the United States, for instance, consumer goods account for a much higher share of industrial output. It is necessary to give due consideration to these questions in the long-term plans and strategies currently being elaborated.

The report devoted much space to the reform in price formation. With good reason, as this question is causing serious concern among the Soviet people. The working people are rightly criticizing the government, the State Committee on Prices, and the trade unions too, because they have failed to avert unjustified price increases for many goods. It is true that everything stagnated during the period of stagnation, with the exception of prices. Unfortunately, however, prices have continued to rise in recent years. The trend toward the disappearance of cheap goods is continuing. The price formation organs, including the State Committee on Prices, are doing little to counter the efforts of many economic managers to establish higher prices for their goods by any means available, and to cover up blatant bad management with price increases.

More than once the AUCCTU has drawn the attention of the government and the USSR Gosplan to the poor situation regarding prices and to the need to implement a firmer state policy on this important social issue. It is, I would say, not just social, but also a political issue. The government owes it to the people to ensure that our national economy produces relatively cheap goods for children, youngsters, and old people in sufficient quantity and the necessary range. The situation may otherwise deteriorate to such an extent that we will have to introduce coupons for baby diapers, jackets, and booties.

As for the proposed radical reform of retail prices, it must definitely be preceded by a broad, nationwide discussion of all its aspects, including the conditions governing the compensation of the additional expenditure to be borne by the population, which must be in full accordance with the principles of social justice.

Esteemed comrades, in the course of the discussion of the theses, in the report, and in delegates' speeches, serious criticism and claims have been directed at the AUCCTU and the trade unions. We are aware of the fact that trade union organizations and our trade union apparatus are slow in restructuring their work. There is still a lot of stage-management, formalism, and arrogance on the part of the trade unions and not enough

genuine concern for people. We have gotten too used to the idea that in our society there is no cause for social conflict, for working people's actions in this respect. We are not always following Lenin's instructions to the effect that our trade unions "...have by no means lost, and, unfortunately, are unlikely to lose for many years to come, the task of the nonclass economic struggle, such as the struggle against the bureaucratic distortions of the soviet apparatus, or the protection of the material and spiritual interests of the mass of the working people"...

The economic reform has considerably expanded the scope of the trade unions' functions in defending working people's rights. The working people demand from us, from the AUCCTU, and all trade union organs, that we take up a more principled stance on questions on the introduction of new methods of economic activity, the establishment of well-founded economic and social normatives, the release of workers from their jobs and job placement, ensuring full employment, and combating violations of labor and leisure regulations, "black" Saturdays, and all other manifestations of excessive departmental zeal.

They rightly believe that the restructuring must be implemented for the sake of the working people's interests, and not at their expense. Trade unions and, we believe, the party and the government, must adopt extraordinary measures for the current crucial stage of restructuring to protect self-management from all encroachments from ministries, departments, local organs, and any others. Strange as it may seem, the law which enshrines and protects the rights of the labor collective needs protection itself at the moment.

An objective social need now consists of enhancing the role of trade unions as a guarantor of the social securities [sotsialnoy zashchishchennost] of the working people. We have drawn the necessary conclusions from this and there is a great deal I could say on this subject. However, the time limit and your wishes, comrade delegates, not to engage in self-praise exempt me from the duty to report what specific steps our trade unions are taking to restructure their work in line with the new conditions.

However, I must dwell on the following. We especially support the propositions in the report regarding the need to rid the political system of the command-and-administrative methods of management and to create political mechanisms and guarantees that would forestall the violation of Leninist principles of party leadership of public organizations in the future. After all, it is no secret that some party organs regard the transmission mechanism from the party to the masses as rigidly coupled cogs in a transmission box in which there can be no thought of any kind of independence for trade union organizations. Direct intervention in the internal affairs of trade unions, including structural questions, is considered permissible, and there are attempts to find jobs in the trade unions for officials, some of whom have proved incompetent or compromised themselves in their former jobs in the economic, soviet, or party sphere. This method of leadership not only does not impart vigor and principledness to trade union organs. On the contrary, it makes them sluggish and unenterprising, and essentially weakens the link between the party organ and the masses rather than strengthening it.

Most Communists are trade union members. Some 4.5 million of them have been elected to leading trade union organs from the grassroots to the top. This, in effect, is the real, tremendous party force which ensures the firm and indestructible link between the party and the masses of the working people, and the former's leading role. This, in effect, is the vanguard which is to spearhead the restructuring of trade union work.

I cannot but touch upon Comrade Yeltsin's speech.

[M.S. Gorbachev] Your time is up.

[S.A. Shalayev] All right. Comrades! I end here. We, all the conference delegates, would very much like the 19th conference and its decisions to become a mighty organizing force which will accelerate our progress along the path of restructuring. (Applause).

Estonia's Vyalyas Delivers Speech

LD0107224188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1612 GMT 1 Jul 88

["Excerpts" of speech by Vayno Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 1 July—recorded]

[Text] Our delegation of the Estonian party organization has come to Moscow, having been sent on its way with a message at a meeting, unprecedented in its emotionally charged character and its scale, organized at the initiative of a mass movement in support of restructuring which was born recently in our republic. It was said there: May your every step be imbued with responsibility, both for the fate of your own people, and for the fate of the processes of restructuring which are going on in the whole country, for the continuation and deepening of the policy of renewal begun by the 27th CPSU Congress. Some 100,000 people were present at that meeting at Pevcheskoye Polye—you have heard of our festival there. That is a popular mandate.

It must be said that that was a good lesson for many party committees in the formation of the package of our proposals. I ask you to regard these proposals, which I have already handed to the Secretariat, simply as my speech. Especially, dear comrades, since, as my great frind the writer Karpov, has already said: Today you are elected, and by tomorrow you are already a bureaucrat. I was elected exactly 2 weeks ago, but I assure you that I have absolutely no desire to join the ranks of bureaucrats. And therefore, rules are rules, and I request you to

take account of our proposals then. I just wanted to tell you in brief about some points which are especially important for the republic and for the republic's party organization.

Life has proven more than once that when contradictions are ignored, they become a source of serious tensions. Therefore, the source from which many of them—distortions in the economy—arise is departmental, overcentralized management. It is manifested at times in the very ugliest forms. More than 90 percent of the whole economic potential of the republics is virtually in the hands of dozens of union and union republic ministries and departments. Under the existing conditions it is practically impossible to unite them, their interests, with the interests of the comprehensive development of the republic. And so it is very gratifying that regional financial autonomy and self-financing, in particular, have found general support here, at this high party forum. Of course, regional financial autonomy has nothing in common with economic isolation or parochial egoism. On the contrary, it assumes complete responsibility of the region for the effective utilization of its own natural, production and labor resources while maintaining the economic ties that have developed and observing the interests of the whole state, which are the most dear to all of us.

Our delegation fully supports those ideas that were expressed in the general secretary's report and his speech, and in the two major draft resolutions in whose examination I took part. We believe that they are a reliable guarantee of the restoration of Leninist norms in our party life and state life. We have to restore the Leninist principles of federalism as the basis of relations between nationalities and republics.

Esteemed comrades, it happens that I have spent the last 8 years in diplomatic work. The new thinking and the political courage of our Central Committee in foreign policy are already yielding visible results. Trust in our country is gaining a hold, its authority has grown immeasurably, and a reliable foundation has been laid for new, bold steps along the road of disarmament. This policy is supported by all our peoples and by all people of good will in the whole world. This is again a high mandate of confidence in the Soviet people and our Leninist party. [applause]

I want to say something exclusively personal with regard to the speech by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. He was in Nicaragua heading a Supreme Soviet delegation there on behalf of the Central Committee. He met the people and the Sandinist leadership there. From early in the morning to late at night Daniel Ortega himself sat at the wheel and we drove around the country. The Sandinists asked: Tell us about restructuring; it is so important for us. But then after the October plenum the Sandinists asked the Soviet ambassador: Which Yeltsin are we to believe: what he said to us, or what happened afterward?

We have here a question of party ethics and a party conscience. One can talk about rehabilitation. I believe that our high party forum is capable of doing this. But whether a person can rehabilitate his party conscience is, probably, a question for the Communist himself, and there must be the courage to talk about this. I believe that our party forum will solve problems calmly and in a party-like and principled manner. We have the party wisdom and the endurance for this. But I say: a person who speaks before a high party forum must have the party conscience for this.

Assails Yeltsin Tactlessness

PM0307095988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 10-11

[Speech by V.I. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, at 1 July evening session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Delegates! Our delegation from the Estonian party organization has come to Moscow after a send-off from an unprecedentedly emotional and large-scale rally organized on the initiative of the recently established mass movement of the people's front in support of restructuring. The address to the delegates said: "May each step you take be imbued with responsibility both for your own people's destiny and for the destiny of the restructuring processes taking place in the country and the continuation and deepening of the renewal policy begun by the 27th CPSU Congress." More than 100,000 people attended this rally in Pevcheskiy field. This is the people's mandate. It must be said that in formulating a package of proposals, it was a good lesson for many party committees. I passed on our proposals to the conference presidium. I ask for the proposals which I passed on to be taken into account in just the same way as my speech. And the more so, dear comrades, since—as my great friend the writer Karpov said—I reluctantly took over in unfortunate circumstances [ya nevolno popal v metriku ochen pechalnuyu]. He said: "Today you have been elected, but tomorrow you will be a bureaucrat." I was elected exactly 2 weeks ago, but I can assure you that I in no way want to become a bureaucrat. I would like to cite several facts that are particularly important for the republic and the republic party organization.

Life has repeatedly shown that when contradictions are ignored, they become a cause of serious tension; that is why departmental over-centralized administration is a source of many economic distortions. This sometimes takes the ugliest forms. To all intents and purposes, more than 90 percent of the republic's entire economic potential is in the hands of dozens of union and union republic ministries and departments. It is virtually impossible, given the existing relationship, to bring their interests into line with the interests of the republic's comprehensive development. On the initiative of the public, we recently raised at a joint plenum of creative unions a whole serious of acute problems in the sphere of the

economy, culture, social development, national relations, ecology, and the formation of a legal state. And that is why it is very gratifying that here, at this lofty party forum, regional economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing have been generally supported. Needless to say, regional economic accountability has nothing to do with economic isolation or parochial egoism. On the contrary, it presupposes the complete responsibility of regions for the effective utilization of their natural, production, and labor resources while maintaining existing economic ties and observing general state interests that are very valuable for all of us. We are all in one way or another controlled by opinions that are customary to everyone and, therefore, often prejudiced. Sometimes, if some phenomena take place, the question is asked: What is happening in Estonia? What is happening—under the conditions of democratization and glasnost, of course—is a process of reassessing former values, and a growth in national self-awareness. This is a difficult process; it is not without its costs and certain aberrations, but it is natural. When this relies on a reluctance and inability to understand the newness of the situation and a desire to act using old methods, substituting partial concessions for the resolution of urgent problems, a tense situation is created. That is why our delegation wholly supports the ideas expressed in the report by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, his speeches, and the two main draft resolutions, which I took part in drawing up.

We believe that this is a reliable guarantee for the restoration of Leninist norms in our party and state life. We will have to restore Leninist principles of federalism as the basis for interethnic and interrepublican relations. We are of the opinion in our republic that the time has come to switch to a qualitatively new form of combining local and statewide interests. Our idea of regional economic accountability—an idea that is widely supported by the people—is that the logic of economic accountability and self-financing that now forms the basis of enterprises' work should also be applied at territory level.

Esteemed comrades! I have been engaged in diplomatic work for the past 8 years, in South America and later, in Nicaragua. I have seen with my own eyes the high price paid for freedom and the implementation of revolutionary transformations.

Indeed, it is sometimes said from such lofty rostrums that "there is no place here for emotion." But permit me, nonetheless, to beg 2 minutes of your attention. Some 4 weeks ago, I was in the front-line zone of Esteli on the border with Honduras. You know, the main contra camps are there on Honduran territory. I visited members of cooperatives. The summer sowing is under way; they are plowing this land given to them by the revolution, plowing it with a submachinegun slung over their shoulder. They have to defend their land. And in their conversation with the Soviet ambassador, these peasants asked how things were with us and how the Soviet people were living. And do you know what these simple peasants said? They had many questions; they talked for a long time and smoked. Although this seems not to be particularly recommended nowadays...

M.S. Gorbachev. No, we haven't gotten around to that yet, but we will do....

V.I. Vyalyas. You know, these peasants said: "Tell Soviet people in Moscow, tell Companero Miguel (that's you, Mikhail Sergeyevich) that we believe the Soviet Union. We believe it because we know that people there are our friends, the friends of all the oppressed, the friends of people who are struggling for their freedom." This is a very high mandate of trust. (Applause). That is why the new thinking and political courage of our party's Central Committee in foreign policy are already producing tangible results. Confidence in our country is being affirmed, its prestige has grown immeasurably, and reliable foundations have been laid for new bold steps along the road of disarmament. This policy is supported by all our peoples and all people of goodwill worldwide, and this again is a high mandate of trust in the Soviet people and our Leninist party. (Applause).

Dear Comrades! I want to say something deeply personal about Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's speech. He was in Nicaragua and headed the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation there. He met with the people and the Sandinist leadership. From early morning to late at night, Daniel Ortega himself drove us as we traveled around the country. The Sandinists asked: "Tell us about restructuring. This is so important for us." And then, after the October Plenum, the Sandinists asked the Soviet ambassador which Yeltsin should they trust: the one who spoke to us, or the later version? This is a question of party ethics and party conscience. We can talk about rehabilitation; I think that our lofty party forum can do this. But can a person rehabilitate his own party conscience? This is probably a question for the Communist himself, and there must be the boldness to talk about it. (Applause).

The point is that, addressing workers at a textile combine (a poor textile combine, let it be said—we are helping to build it), perhaps out of thoughtlessness, perhaps out of tiredness, he let himself say: "What's the matter with you, don't you want to work? You've not even made it into short pants yet." Unfortunately, this was broadcast on television. And there was an interpreter alongside who faithfully translated everything. It hurt because there are indeed guys in Nicaragua who still do not have any clothes. No clothes. And you know, when we talk about internationalism, what a gift it was when we received the simplest presents from Sverdlovsk (I stress that), from Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, Leningrad, and Estonia. A Nicaraguan child may have been holding a toy for the first time. That is internationalism. But, on the other hand, party conscience always suggests: Be respectful toward those friends you [ty] visit.

I think that our party forum is resolving problems in a calm, party-minded, and principled manner; we have the party wisdom and endurance to do this. But I say that people who address lofty party forums must have the party conscience to do so.

Tomorrow we return home and the people will ask us: "Did you do everything to be honest to the party?" And we must say: "Yes, we did do everything." And we must—each of us—have a complete moral right to say to the people that we did not spend 4 days here for nothing, we were honest to our party conscience, and we correctly defined ways to resolve the main questions on which the further destiny of restructuring and the destiny of socialism depend. (Applause).

Pukhova on Women's Status

PM0407190988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 11

[Speech by Z.P. Pukhova, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women, at 1 July evening session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Delegates! I was very worried about whether I would be given a chance to speak, and this is why. Do you know what the people have begun calling the Committee of Soviet Women? The committee for the defense of women. Against whom? What sort of defense? What kind of help are women asking for?

It seemed that during the years of Soviet power an extensively ramified system of social guarantees developed. Each of the recent 5-year plans has been marked by new benefits for women. Maternity and child welfare has been raised to the level of state policy. But have all of these ideas been implemented? Not in the least. V.I. Lenin stressed more than once that equal rights for women is not only an economic and social category; it is primarily a political one.

Yes, it must be acknowledged today with utmost frankness that the position of women is still a social and political problem and a question of state significance, as the conference report noted. The solution of this problem also depends on the success of restructuring. Restructuring, in turn, will depend on women and on how actively they participate in it.

As was the case in 1917, so it must be now, too. The task of enlisting women in the sphere of social labor, a task posed by V.I. Lenin, was resolved incredibly quickly. In this respect, too, we surpassed all the countries of the world. In the past 70 years in our country the new type of Soviet woman has been shaped, the worker, the mother, and the citizen. But what kind of conditions are there for woman to combine these roles? The urgency of this problem, unfortunately, is still not recognized by our society. We are trying to understand just how disastrous for our environment is the pollution of Lake Baykal. These questions have been raised in very acute terms at the conference, and this is absolutely correct. But we still do not realize the irreparable consequences that a disdainful attitude toward women may have for present and future generations. A vast number of women are employed in physically demanding, labor-intensive work. Almost 3.5 million women are working in conditions which do not meet the labor protection norms and rules, in smoky, dusty shops with high noise levels and unfavorable temperature ranges. Country women become prematurely aged from working from dawn till dusk, without days off or vacations, deprived of basic social and everyday comforts, and appropriate medical help. These are the facts, and they are distressing and alarming.

What other sector has such intensive labor as the textile industry, where 80 percent of the workforce are women? I myself worked for around 30 years in a weaving production unit. I know from personal experience what the weaver's work is like: the noise, the humidity, the dust, the constant stress, and more night shifts than any other sector. The weaver's pulse rate, I have to tell you, is over 90 beats a minute, almost the same as a forge worker. It cannot be ignored that despite equality of women's rights in labor remuneration there is still a real inequality in the level of skill, and thus in wages. Yet there are millions of single women in the country whose wages are their sole means of existence.

It seemed that the introduction of the radical economic reform would change the situation. It should have, but so far the new reform has merely created fresh problems. The transfer of enterprises to economic accountability and self-financing and the introduction of such forms of labor organization as the team contract struck at the most vulnerable section of the labor collective: women with children. We have not discussed this at the conference today. By trying to exercise their right to a short working day, a short working week, flex-time, and extra vacation, women involuntarily conflict with the administration or the labor collective of the shop or team and become an unwanted workforce. When staff cuts are made, women are the first to be sacked.

Under conditions of economic accountability there are also the problems of the division of children into "ours" and "theirs" in departmental preschool and extramural institutions, a point which Comrade Fedotova made from this rostrum, the restriction of resources for cultural and health purposes, and the unwarranted economizing on sponsorship aid. But these are far from being solely economic problems. The introduction of multishift work has aggravated the female worker's problems. Instead of putting their technical ingenuity to work, economic leaders often manipulate work time, devise different schedules, introduce "black Saturdays," and give no thought to the idea of completely excluding women from night shift work.

There are now around 4 million women working on night shifts in our country. The fundamentals of the labor law clearly state that night shift work for women is

forbidden and tolerated only as a temporary measure in cases of special need. Hasn't this temporary measure gone on too long? The Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry, the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, and a number of others have been withdrawing women from the night shift at such a slow pace that it will take us more than 50 years to complete the job. Is it not time to demand that the law be enforced? The fact that the law is being violated, and fairly frequently, is demonstrated by the tens of thousands of women who appeal to our committee for justice. They complain that women are being sacked while on maternity leave, that pregnant women are not transferred to light work, and that people try not to hire women with small children.

Women have been granted extensive constitutional rights. But the most important thing today is to protect those rights from violation. We do not have a mechanism to guarantee social protection for women and to monitor the execution of the law. Such a mechanism already exists in most countries in the world.

We propose to instruct the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development to study this question and to provide a special program for women in preparing comprehensive social programs. It is necessary to introduce into the system an analysis of the social consequences of the decisions made by the government.

The new thinking also demands a new approach to the problem of promoting women to leading work—economic, social, and state work—and to the decisionmaking level. We are in no way arguing for the replacement of men by women or for the promotion of women according to a quota system. The criteria must be the same. How can it be that, as sociological research shows, 48 percent of men with higher or secondary education, almost 1 in 2, are in leading work at all levels, whereas for women the figure is only 7 percent? There are no women leaders of union ministries and there are just a handful in republic ministries.

Until quite recently there were 10 women among the 15 republic social security ministers, but now that figure is only 4. Women make up 7 percent of party obkom and kraykom secretaries even though 29 percent of party members are women. Is it fair or is it in the state's interests that the promotion of women to leadership work is being held back at a time when women make up 61 percent of specialists with higher or secondary education?

Mikhail Sergeyevich, we are glad that the report clearly expressed the idea that women be given extensive access to leading organs at all levels and that questions directly affecting women's interests should not be resolved without their participation. We hope that this will be supported at our conference.

Comrades! I should like to draw your attention to another question. Recently in the periodical press and on radio and television the opinion has been expressed increasingly often that women are losing their characteristic qualities because of overwork at their job and in the home; that they have no time to bring up their children; and that this is why there is strife in the family and an increasing number of divorces. The conclusion being drawn is that women should return to the home.

Is this a fair conclusion? Should we abandon a very important achievement like the real equality of women and deprive them of the chance to enjoy social status and show themselves as creative individuals? Furthermore, the national economy, in which more than half the work force is women, cannot do without them. The overwhelming majority of women themselves (80 percent), when asked whether they would leave work if their family were fully provided for, say "No!" One cannot see women as responsible for all ills. The real causes go deeper and are rooted in the lagging behind of the economy and scientific and technical progress, the neglect of the social sphere, and breaches of legislation. Women are tired of waiting in line and weary of shortages of food and consumer goods. Transport works badly, particularly in the big cities, and the journey to and from work therefore consumes a lot of energy. The present-day consumer service is virtually incapable of helping the family, its network is underdeveloped, there are extremely few services, and they are beyond the means of many.

It is customary to associate the home and the rearing of children solely with the woman. Yes, motherhood is a unique and sacred experience. A mother has a high responsibility and important role, but the father's responsibility is equally great. It is essential to enhance the standing of fatherhood and of the family as a whole. The system of socioeconomic guarantees for the family should be substantially expanded. We need to think about ensuring that the benefits which are today basically intended for the woman be directed at the family. The family itself will decide who enjoys them. When talking about social protection, one should not forget those women, albeit few in number, who have chosen to work in the home and bring up their children, as opposed to taking part in social production. They lack many rights enjoyed by working women—old-age pension, sick benefits, and so forth. In our opinion, the time has come to discuss questions of social safeguards for nonworking mothers. I also want to talk about soldiers' widows, who have endured the burden of the Great Patriotic War. Their pension is extremely small. We know that new pension legislation is being prepared, but yet they cannot wait. Is it impossible to do something for them right now? (Applause).

Comrades, restructuring is posing to our society many vitally important questions. Women's councils, which have been revived and created throughout the country since our party's 27th congress, have thrown themselves

energetically into tackling these questions. Women's councils operate solely on a voluntary basis in labor collectives and on the neighborhood level. Many of them are displaying initiative, creativity, and determination and are seeking to solve many problems, particularly those on improving the moral atmosphere in society and the family.

However, the influence of women's councils on specific social questions is inadequate. Not all of them have fully grasped their role and place in public life under the new conditions. They lack confidence in their work and wait to be prompted. This new social movement is not always taken seriously even by party organizations, and women's councils are not always given backing. We support the provisions in the report and delegates' speeches on measures to enhance the role of public organizations in the political process, their representation in the organs of power, and the need to define the legal basis for their activity.

On behalf of the Committee of Soviet Women I would like to say that Soviet women are aware of their measure of responsibility for the fate of their country. They support the party's course of restructuring and will direct all their energy and knowledge toward renewing our society and toward its revolutionary transformation. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Ligachev on Yeltsin Address

LD0107194788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Speech by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 1 July afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] Dear comrades! Perhaps it is more difficult for me than for anyone in the leadership to speak in connection with the speech by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. And not because it referred to me. The time has simply come to tell the whole truth. Why is it difficult to speak? It is difficult to speak because it was I who recommended him for inclusion in the Central Committee Secretariat and the Politburo. What was I proceeding from? I proceeded from the fact that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin is an energetic person, that at the time he had great experience in leading the prominent Sverdlovsk Oblast party organization, which is a big one respected by all in our party. I saw this organization in action when I was in Sverdlovsk as a secretary, and visited Sverdlovsk as a secretary of the party Central Committee.

I cannot be silent, because Communist Yeltsin has taken the wrong road. It has turned out that this person has not a constructive but a destructive force. His evaluation of the process of restructuring, his approaches and methods of work have been recognized by the party as groundless and mistaken. Note, comrades, that such a conclusion was reached both by the Moscow gorkom and the party Central Committee when he was in good health. More than 50 people spoke at the plenums of the Moscow gorkom and the CPSU Central Committee. All of them unanimously adopted the decision that you are familiar with.

I was expecting his speech. I knew that he was going to speak. There are sensible proposals in his speech. But on the whole, it went to show that you, Boris, have not drawn the right political conclusions. What is more, you presented the whole of our policy as an improvization from start to finish. Note, comrades, the policy of restructuring had been announced without a profound analysis—announced, by the way—I am quoting. And it had been started differently from the way it should have been started. It had not achieved any noticeable results. That means that everything that was said in the report and in the delegates' speeches during these 4 days on this score is nothing but fantasies. It means that the work of the party and the people is in vain.

Well, excuse me, but that is profoundly mistaken, at the very least. And speaking objectively, it is aimed at sowing about—and that is so much what they are waiting for from us abroad—sowing doubt about the correctness of the execution of the party's political course. Forgive me, but you [Yeltsin] and I already differ not only on tactics, but also on strategy. Incidentally, you are making use of a very dubious method. It is simply not comradely. First you ascribe something to another person which is not true of him, and then you attack and condemn him. That is strange, at the very least. In connection with this, I request, comrades, that you give me the opportunity to briefly set out my stand, my view of the work of the party and its policy.

In its most compressed form, one could say the following: The position of the Politburo is also my position. As far as how I work, that is for you to judge. But I can say with complete sincerity that the policy of restructuring and acceleration is a cause both in your lives and in mine. My comrades and I do not think in any other way. History has posed the issue thus: Either doom the country to further vegetation, or gather the strength to break out and go forward to fresh progress. That is how things stand. We have no third option.

I think that I will be speaking... [changes thought] You will all completely agree that the present party conference really does add even greater confidence and political experience. It will be no exaggeration to say that in the days that have passed, what has been happening in this hall has substantially advanced our great cause of restructuring. I would like to draw your attention to one thing: how much speculation there has been abroad on the eve of the conference. Whole volumes were written, particularly about the split in the leadership that was supposed to have taken shape. All these forecasts have burst like soap bubbles. One can already say that we are leaving the party conference with the whole of our leading nucleus even more cohesive, even stronger in the

struggle for the restructuring of all spheres of our society. [applause] Moreover, I would like to stress that this is not an imaginary, but an actual cohesion, and it has been won in discussion, in a lively exchange of opinions in the name of strengthening socialism.

It is very important, comrades, to see and to understand what forces we have available to us. They are immense—the whole course of our conference bears witness to that. It really does demonstrate the awakened thinking of the people, in which immense transforming strength is inherent. But at the same time—and I would like to ask for your attention here—it would be, from whatever point of view you like, both political and moral, simply intolerable to forget, and it is not forgotten in the report, that after the October revolution, for decades, millions of Communists and working people gave their strength, their courage, their lives, in the struggle precisely so there would be more socialism. I would go further and say that their party cards, their labor biographies, were not stained with lack of principle and careerism. Their bright names and their labor feats, which laid the foundations for the material and cultural richness of your motherland, continue today to serve the transforming work of the party and people.

Comrades, it is not, unfortunately, from hearsay that I know about the cult of personality. I did not want to talk about this, but since I am being frank, I would like to say that in my family there have been people who were shot and people who were excluded from the party. Following the 20th party congress they were all rehabilitated as citizens and Communists. But we know how much our people were heroic, despite the cult of personality and the phenomena of stagnation. Here, in this respect, I fully support the speeches of Comrades Bondarev and Oleynik. [applause]

Comrades, can one really agree when, under the flag of restoring the historical truth, what often happens is its complete distortion? Can one really agree with it when Soviet people—and this is in our own press publications—are presented as slaves, and I am almost quoting, who were supposedly fed only by lies and demagogy, with all the people being subjected to the cruellest exploitation? Our press has indeed done much work for restructuring, but at the same time—and I say this with great sadness—individual, I stress individual newspaper editors have apparently taken the respectful attitude and trust placed in them by the Central Committee and the general secretary of the Central Committee as an opportunity to do as they wish, to get away from party control, while cliquishness allows them to use the newspapers to settle their own scores and to give support to unworthy people. It is to them that the ideas belong concerning growing resistance to restructuring, the seeking out of enemies of restructuring, and the compilation of lists of them. And, by the way, very often readers' letters are selected quite tendentiously to this end. [applause] One must suppose that the Central Committee and editorial staffs will draw the proper conclusions from the completely correct and principled speeches by delegates.

During the years of stagnation I lived and worked in Siberia, a harsh land but a truly wonderful one. I am often asked what I was doing at that time, and I reply with pride: I was building socialism. And there were millions like me. [applause] It would be treachery if I were to say nothing about those with whom I bound up my destiny, and with whom I shared joys and sorrow; many of them have already left this life. We did not always succeed straight away; we had to get things finished, and redo things, but we worked without looking over our shoulders—perhaps because we knew that they couldn't send you further than Siberia. [laughter and applause] We worked so that people would have a better life, so that they would render their due to the state and would defend the interests of the oblast.

I did not want to talk about this, but you will understand why I am saying it. For more than 10 years the oblast where I worked, together with comrades taking part here in the conference, has been providing itself totally and completely with locally produced food products, and moreover the food ration is a good one. But you, Boris, worked as obkom secretary for 9 years, and imposed coupons on the oblast, and for a long time. [applause] That is what the political phrase and the reality means. That is what divergence between word and deed means. [applause]

But there is something else I would like to speak of, because judgements about Ligachev are usually made only from one side. At that time, phenomena of stagnation were growing in the country, in the center, and in many regions. I now know more about this than when I was working in Siberia. The country was rolling toward a crisis. Abuses of office, corruption, and bribe-taking were becoming widespread. Discipline was declining, society was being corroded by drunkenness. The international prestige of our country was steadily declining. And right at the top—now I know this perhaps better than anyone else—moral decay was taking place. This was accompanied by the unrestrained lauding of the former leadership of the country. A threatening danger hung over the party. It was not for nothing that Vladimir Ilich Lenin said: All the revolutionary parties that have so far perished have perished because they came to think too much of themselves, and they were unable to see where their strengths were, and were afraid to talk about their weaknesses.

And so came the days, not in April—I would like to draw attention to this—came the March 1985 Central Committee plenum that decided the issue of the general secretary of the Central Committee. The truth is, those were very anxious days, very anxious hours. Destiny put me at the center of those events, so that I do have the possibility of judging. Comrades, the decisions could have been absolutely different. And others would be

sitting here, if there could be a party conference at all. And I think: What would have become of the country afterward. At that time, this was a real danger. And I want to tell you that thanks to the firm stand adopted by members of the Politburo, Comrade Chebrikov, Comrades Solomentsev and Gromyko, and a large group of obkom first secretaries, the only correct decision was adopted at the March plenum. [applause].

The April Central Committee plenum looked reality straight in the eye, exposed the mistakes, and determined the strategy of renewal and acceleration. That is the essence of my understanding of that time, and it seems to me that this is where the dialectical unity of renewal and continuity lies.

Now a few words about the rate of restructuring. I shall probably be saying things that are already known, but i want to say that restructuring is a difficult and prolonged process.

It is very important, comrades, not to evade pressing problems, but to tackle them vigorously and innovatively, yet without being impulsive, and circumspectly, while giving consideration to the consequences. Engaging in politics is not like gulping down soup, if you will excuse me for being so crude. One has to be circumspect as well as resolute. Wisdom has it that before going in, you should think about how to get out, and with good reason. The main thing is that we must progress in practice, in deeds, and tangible results. I say that we literally have to hold up results as the crucial criterion in assessing collectives as a whole, and each worker individually. People say about a great many people in our country: He's a windbag who achieves practically nothing.

I would like to say a few words about the work of the Central Committee Secretariat. I have been entrusted with running the routine work of the Central Committee secretariat on the instructions of the Politburo. The secretariat is laying special stress on the organization and monitoring of routine work. I will be frank with you: In studying the situation in the provinces and in the center, and in discussing questions put to the Central Committee, the Central Committee secretaries sometimes come up against manifestations of poor discipline among cadres and, I would also say, of total sluggishness in leadership. How do we act in such cases? Answers are demanded in true party style, for we have agreed that society should have no zones closed to criticism and self-criticism. During the most acute discussions of problems in the Central Committee—and I would like to emphasize this—exactingness is always accompanied by a spirit of respect for one's comrades. And, of course, nobody has charged anyone with the task of seeking out negative facts. It would be a loathsome thing if that were the case, as regards anyone, although Comrade Yeltsin spoke of this at the Central Committee Plenum. He accused the Central Committee secretariat of that... [pauses] accused us of that which he himself was implanting in the Moscow gorkom. Incidentally, when he was a secretary of the party gorkom, he never once attended a sitting of the secretariat. And I would like to mention something else to you. It's hard to believe, but it's a fact: As a member of the Politburo and attending its sittings—and they last for 8, 9, or 10 hours—he took hardly any part in discussions of the country's vitally important problems or in the adoption of decisions awaited by the people. He kept silent and bided his time. It's monstrous, but it's a fact. Does this really signify party comradeship, Boris?

The Central Committee secretaries and apparatus see their task and the point of their activities in rendering assistance and in arranging work in the provinces. This, incidentally, is indicated by the tours of the country which have now become the rule for Central Committee secretaries and workers of the Central Committee apparatus, so they can work in the provinces and come into contact with party aktivs and labor collectives. But it would be wrong of me not to mention the following, comrades. There are serious shortcomings and weaknesses in the work of the secretariat. We are dreadfully involved in solving routine economic questions—thoroughly so, to be frank. Sometimes we adopt new decisions without ensuring implementation of those already adopted. In short, we have scope for improvement and we must put in more work, though I also state frankly that we have no intention of complaining about the excessive workload, and that my comrades are working at full stretch. This applies first and foremost to the general secretary. [applause] In this connection I would like to say that we calmly accept the 10-year term, because for many of us in the present composition of the Politburo there is no prospect of a 10-year term—may God give us the strength even for 5 years! [applause]

Finally, two or three issues in the most concise form, in the most concise form. The question of social justice has been raised here, and it's one that worries me as well. The essence of socialist social justice is that people receive according to their labor. It is said this principle is not being observed in our society, and that it is often violated; this is true. But in saying this, the most frequent complaint is about the party apparatus. I think there are one or two things which have to be clarified here and looked into calmly. It transpires that contrary to the widely held view, party workers come 26th in the country as regards pay—the average pay of a party worker is R216. Loss of pay is often considerable. This is a common phenomenon which the comrades have spoken of here, in particular, Comrade Saranskikh, secretary of the Cherepovets party gorkom. When a specialist from the national economy is put forward for work in party bodies he suffers a large loss of pay. This is the reason, incidentally, why the composition of party workers is deteriorating. I was reminded of this, with concern—I would like to convey it to you—by many workers and Communists when I recently visited Kuybyshev Oblast. Approximately the same position exists as regards other privileges. In short, I would like to say the following. In

the very near future we should publish official data on this issue, because the people and the party really do have the right to know the truth. In the meantime we are feeding on ersatz from the newspaper, from such a well-known newspaper—I would like to call it something different—as MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. [applause]

I would like to say the following, comrades, and what I am about to say is not taken from books, but from life. The party worker has one privilege—to be at the front, to fight for the party's policy, and to serve his people in faith and truth. Believe me, he has no other privileges. [applause] There are people who are pushing us in the direction of levelling, identifying this with social justice. At times they are doing this in order to be accepted as one of us among the masses. Levelling generates dependency and reduces people and their labor to the same level. It's true that there are people in our society who enjoy underserved privileges, and who are guilty of embezzling public funds. Things have to be put firmly in order here, and we have begun this work. Incidentally, I would like to mention that [this work began] as far back as 1 year to 18 months before April 1985, in particular concerning Uzbekistan, Krasnodar Kray, and so forth. Even then, when the country had different leaders—although for those involved it was a very dangerous business, as at any moment they might have quite easily ended up as ambassador to a very remote country—even then Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, I want to tell you the truth, that there should be no zones in the party or society which are beyond criticms or control.

We began then; we are continuing that work in a persistent and consistent way; and, believe me, we are doing all we can, together with you, of course, to prevent the return of the former embezzlers and bribe-takers who besmirched the clean image of the Soviet leader. We are telling them that their time is up. [applause]

Finally, the last thing—discipline in the party. Various points of view clash in the process of debate, and this, comrades, is wonderful, it is normal. But what is bad, and I would like to draw your attention to this, is when a Communist and member of the Central Committee who has failed to receive the party's support appeals to the bourgeois press regarding his behavior. There's no getting round this fact, as they say. Evidently he wants to remind people about himself and to please them. It's sometimes said about such people that they are simply incapable of missing an opportunity to speak. Do you like having all the foreigners attend you, Boris? Listen, if you're going to give interviews, believe me, there will be no time for anything else. How many times we appealed to you, when we appealed to you! But that, so to speak, was just for our personal friends. They are also writing various things about us; abroad they are writing various things about Ligachev. And the enemies are sparing neither time nor words for this. Sometimes I am asked my attitude towards this. It is the same as a great Russian poet once said: In the wild cries of bitterness I hear sounds of approval. [applause]

We are following our path, comrades, the path of peace and socialism. The party and its leadership are united. There are no factions, reformers, or conservatives here, though some would very much like them to exist, including, unfortunately, some people in our country. This talk is being foisted on us in order to split the leadership, but as I have already had occasion to say, we are now in different times, we have a different policy and different leaders. We are all deeply committed to the policy of restructuring, and see in that great cause the meaning of our remaining life. [applause]

Ligachev Address Published

PM0207162388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 11

[Speech by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 1 July afternoon session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! It is perhaps harder for me than for any member of the leadership to speak about the speech by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Not because it was about me. It is simply that the time has come to tell the whole truth. Why is it hard for me to speak about this? Because I recommended him for membership of the Central Committee secretariat and later for the Politburo. What were my grounds for doing that? I proceeded from the premise that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin is an energetic man and had at that time great experience in the leadership of the Sverdlovsk Oblast party organization, a prominent organization respected by all in our party. I saw that organization at work when I visited Sverdlovsk as Central Committee secretary.

I cannot remain silent because Communist Yeltsin has taken the wrong path. It turned out that he possesses not creative energy but destructive energy. His assessments of the process of restructuring and of the approaches and work methods acknowledged by the party are unfounded and mistaken. That was the conclusion reached by the Moscow party gorkom and the Central Committee Plenum, which he attended when he was in good health. More than 50 people addressed plenums of the Moscow gorkom and the CPSU Central Committee and they unanimously adopted the decision which you know well.

His speech contains sensible proposals. But overall it demonstrates that you, Boris, have not drawn the correct political conclusions.

Furthermore, you have presented our entire policy as a complete improvisation.

You will note, comrades, that the policy of restructuring was announced without profound analysis: ...they did not begin as they should have done... and did not achieve appreciable results.

Thus, everything said in the report and delegates' speeches on this score over the past 4 days is an utter fiction. Therefore, the labor of the party and the people is in vain? Excuse me, but this is a thorough deception. Objectively speaking it is aimed at sowing doubts—which is precisely what our enemies abroad expect of us. Sowing doubts about the correctness of the pursuit of the party's political course. Forgive me, but you and I differ not only on tactics but also on strategy.

Incidentally, you use a highly dubious method which is simply not comradely: You begin by attributing something uncharacteristic to someone and then you attack and condemn him for it. This is strange, to say the least.

In this regard I would ask you, comrades, to permit me the opportunity to briefly expound my position and my view on the party's work and policy.

Putting it as concisely as possible I would say the following: The Politburo's position is my position, too. You must judge how you work. I can say with the utmost sincerity that the policy of restructuring and acceleration is the cause of not only your, but also of my and my comrades' life.

History has put the question in these terms: Either the country is doomed to further stagnation or we gain strength and forge ahead to progress. That is how the question stands, we have no third course.

I think that you will agree that the present party conference is really gaining even more in confidence and political experience. It will be no exaggeration to say that in the past few days what has happened in this hall has considerably advanced the great cause of restructuring.

I want to draw your attention to one factor. Look at how much speculation there was abroad on the eve of the conference! Whole volumes were written. Particularly about a split which is supposed to have emerged in the leadership. And all these predictions have burst like bubbles.

Even now it may be said that we and all our leading nucleus will emerge from the party conference even more united and even stronger in the struggle for the restructuring of our society. (Applause) Furthermore, I should like to stress that this is not an imaginary cohesion but a real one. And it has been achieved in discussions and the lively exchange of opinions for the sake of the strengthening of socialism.

It is very important, comrades, to see and understand what strengths we possess. They are tremendous. Evidence of that is provided by the entire course of our conference. It demonstrates the awakened thinking of the people, which contains tremendous transforming power.

However, whatever viewpoint you take—the historical, the political, or the moral—it would be simply impermissible to forget, and this was not forgotten in the report, that for decades after the October Revolution, millions of Communists and working people devoted their strength, courage, and lives precisely to the struggle to ensure that there was more socialism. Their party cards and their labor careers were not blemished by lack of principle or by careerism. Their shining names and labor achievements which laid the foundations of our motherland's material and spiritual wealth serve even today the transforming work of the party and the people.

As for the personality cult, I know it, unfortunately, not from mere hearsay. I do not want to talk about myself, but, to be frank, in our family, too, people were shot or expelled from the party. After the 20th party congress they were all rehabilitated as citizens and Communists. And we know how many heroic things our people did despite the personality cult and the phenomena of stagnation, and I fully and wholly support the speeches of Comrades Bondarev and Leynik in this regard. (Applause)

Comrades, is it really possible to accept the fact that under the flag of restoring historical truth, the latter is often completely distorted? Is it really possible to accept the fact that Soviet people—in our printed publications, too!—are presented as slaves (I am almost quoting here) who were allegedly fed only lies and demagoguery and subjected to the harshest exploitation?

Our press has done much work for restructuring. But at the same time, and I say this with great sorrow, some newspaper editors, I stress the word some, clearly took the respect and trust shown them by the Central Committee and the general secretary of Central Committee to mean an opportunity to do as they wish, to evade party control, and to use newspapers for settling personal scores. Factionalism affords support to unworthy people. It is, after all, to them that the idea about the growth of resistance to restructuring belongs, and they originated the appeals to seek out the enemies of restructuring and draw up lists of them. Very often, readers' quite tendentious letters are selected for that purpose. (Applause). Presumably the Central Committee and editorial collegiums of newspapers and journals will draw the appropriate conclusions from delegates' perfectly correct and principled speeches on this score.

During the years of stagnation I lived and worked in Siberia—a harsh land but a truly wonderful one. People often ask me what I was doing at that time. I answer with pride: I was building socialism. There were millions like me. (Applause). It would be a betrayal if I did not speak about those with whom I linked my fate and shared joys and sorrows. Many of them are dead now. Not everything succeeded immediately. We had to finish things, redo them, but we worked without looking over our shoulder, perhaps because we knew that they cannot

send you any further than Siberia. (Animation in the hall). We worked so that people could live better lives, so as to give the state more, and to defend the interests of the oblast.

I did not want to say this but you will understand why I am saying it. For more than 10 years the oblast where I worked with comrades taking part in this conference has been providing itself with food produced completely by its own efforts whereas you, Boris, were obkom secretary for 9 years and you firmly imposed food coupons on the oblast. (Applause). That is the meaning of the political phrase and of reality. That is the meaning of the difference between word and deed. (Applause)

There is something else I want to talk about because sometimes judgments about Ligachev are one-sided. At that time the phenomena of stagnation were growing in the country, in the center, and in many regions. I know more about that now than when I was working in Siberia. The country was heading toward a crisis, there were widespread abuses of power, corruption, and bribery, discipline was declining, society was being eaten away by drunkenness, and our country's international prestige was steadily waning. And at the very top moral decay was taking place, but the country's former leadership was being praised unreservedly. A dreadful danger hung over the party. With good reason V.I. Lenin said: "All the revolutionary parties that have perished so far did so because they were conceited, could not see where their strengths were, and were afraid to speak about their weaknesses."

Then it was the time of the Central Committee plenum—not the April plenum, I should like to draw your attention to that, but the March 1985 plenum, the one which decided the question of the general secretary of the Central Committee. The whole truth must be told: Those were anxious days. I happened to be at the center of those events so I can judge them. The decisions taken could have been completely different. There was a real danger of that.

I want to tell you that the March Central Committee plenum took the only correct decision thanks to the firm stand taken by Politburo members Comrades Chebrikov, Solomentsev, Gromyko, and a large group of obkom first secretaries. (Applause) The April Central Committee plenum looked reality straight in the eyes, revealed the mistakes, and defined the strategy of acceleration and renewal. That is the essence of my understanding of that time and the present and it seems to me that this is where the dialectical unity of renewal and continuity lies.

Now to turn to the pace of restructuring. I am probably about to tell you what you already know. Restructuring is a difficult and lengthy process. And it is very important, comrades, not to duck the urgent problems, to resolve them energetically and innovatively, not impulsively but circumspectly and with the consequences in mind. Engaging in politics is not like gulping down cabbage soup, if you will forgive me for being so crude. In addition to determination there has to be, there absolutely has to be circumspection. With good reason the proverb says: Look before you leap.

The main thing is to progress by practical deeds and tangible results. It is necessary to extol the attainment of results as the decisive criterion for the assessment of each collective and each worker. We have very many people here about whom the people say: He's all talk and no action.

Now a few words about the work of the Central Committee Secretariat. I have been entrusted with running day-to-day work in the Central Committee Secretariat. This is the assignment of the Politburo. The Secretariat places stress on the organization and monitoring of day-to-day work. I shall say frankly that when studying the situation locally and centrally and when discussing questions at the Central Committee, Central Committee secretaries sometimes encounter manifestations of indiscipline of cadres and flaccidity of leadership. How do we act in such cases? There must be true party exactingness. We have agreed that in society there must be no zones closed to criticism or beyond the reach of control. But even during the most acute discussions of problems at the Central Committee, I should like to stress, exactingness is always accompanied by a spirit of respect toward comrades. And of course no one sets anyone else the task of seeking out negative facts. It is simply despicable if that were the case with regard to anyone.

At the Central Committee plenum, B.N. Yeltsin accused the Central Committee Secretariat of that which he himself instilled in the Moscow party gorkom. I should like to note that he, as party gorkom secretary, did not attend Secretariat sessions. I should also like to say this. It is hard to believe, but true, that when he was in the Politburo and attended its sessions, sessions lasting 8-9, even 10 hours, he hardly ever took part in the discussion of the country's vitally important problems or in making the decisions which all the people expected. He kept silent and bided his time. Monstrous but a fact. Can this really be party comradeship, Boris? Central Committee secretaries and the Central Committee apparatus see their task and the point of their activity in giving help and in arranging work in the provinces. This is demonstrated by the now regular working visits by Central Committee secretaries and staffers of the Central Committee apparatus around the country and contacts with the party aktiv and labor collectives.

But I would be wrong if I did not make the following point, too. In the work of the Central Committee Secretariat there are serious shortcomings and weaknesses. We have become greatly involved in resolving current economic questions. Deeply involved. Sometimes we take a new decision without ensuring the fulfillment of old ones. In short, we have reserves and we must work

harder. Although, to be frank, the workload is excessive and my comrades are working flat out. And that applies above all to the general secretary. (Applause)

In this connection I should like to say that we very calmly accept the proposals on the two consecutive terms of election to leading organs, although in view of the strenuous work that we have to do, many of us in the present Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat will need God's help to last even for 5 years. (Applause)

The question of social justice has been raised here. It troubles me, too. To each according to his labor—that is the essence of socialist social justice. They say that this principle is not being observed in our society, that it is often violated. That is right. It is true that in so saying, people often cite the party apparatus. I think that some things need to be clarified here and calmly examined.

Contrary to the widely held opinion, it is the case that party workers are 26th in the country in terms of pay. The party worker's average wage is R216. There is a loss in pay, often a considerable loss, when a national economic specialist is elected to work in the party organs with a great reduction in pay. This is the reason, incidentally, why the composition of party workers is deteriorating. Comrade Saranskikh, a delegate, made that point here with alarm. Many Communist workers spoke to me about that when I visited Kuybyshev Oblast recently.

With regard to privileges in general, I should like to say the following. Official figures should be published on this question in the very near future because indeed the people and the party are entitled to know the truth. For the time being the ersatz from MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is in vogue. (Applause)

The party worker has one privilege—to be at the front, to fight for the party's policy, and to serve his people with faith and truth. (Applause)

There are people who urge us toward wage leveling and identify this with social justice. This is done sometimes to gain acceptance among the masses. Wage leveling engenders parasitism and reduces people's labor to the same level. There are people in our society, and this is true, who undeservedly enjoy privileges and who embezzle state property. Firm order must be established here.

And we have begun this work. Furthermore, we began it a year, we began it 18 months before April 1985, particularly in regard to Uzbekistan and Krasnodar Kray. We began it even when there were different people in the country's leadership. I hope you will understand that these were very dangerous times for those engaged in such work. At any time they might have found themselves, at best, sent as ambassador to some distant country. But even then Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated firmly: In the party and society there must be no zones exempt from criticism or control. This work is now continuing persistently and consistently and, believe me, we are doing everything of course to prevent the return of those who besmirched the bright image of Soviet leader. Their time is over. (Applause)

Finally, a word about discipline within the party. In the process of debate different viewpoints clash. That is wonderful. And it is normal. But it is bad when a Communist and a member of the Central Committee who has failed to win the support of the party appeals to the bourgeois press. The fact cannot be denied. Clearly, Comrade Yeltsin wanted to remind people about himself and to please people. They say about such people that they cannot miss an opportunity to speak. Boris, do you like all these foreigners coming to see you? Listen, if people give interviews endlessly there will be neither time nor strength left for anything else.

They write about us, too. They also write various things abroad about Ligachev. Sometimes they ask how I regard this? Paraphrasing the great Russian poet, I say: Amid the wild cries of bitterness I hear sounds of approval. (Applause)

We are following our road, comrades, the road of peace and socialism. The party and its leadership are united. We have no factions here, reformers or conservatives, even though some people would very much like it if that were so. Such opinions are foisted on us so as to split the leadership. But as I have already said, these are different times now, a different policy, and different leaders. We are all deeply committed to the policy of restructuring. We see the point of our whole life in this great cause. (Prolonged applause)

Kvitsinskiy Address

LD0207033888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1612 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] [Announcer] Delegate Kvitsinskiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Union's ambassador to the FRG, is at the rostrum.

[Begin Kvitsinskiy recording] In foreign policy affairs much has begun moving under the influence of CPSU initiatives. Great interest is being shown toward our country, but it would be wrong to think that we have proclaimed and are implementing new thinking in international affairs. This new thinking has by no means become the prevailing factor in relations between states in today's world. Its firm establishment will be achieved by an acute struggle that will require a relatively long time and a great intensity of effort.

Not everything, comrades, is rose colored. There are a large number of politicians abroad who are verbally showing interest or even an attitude of goodwill toward restructuring but who in practice are pinning hopes on it for the implementation of all kinds of hoary old plans to force socialism out of its positions and to realize their territorial, political, and other ambitions with regard to

us and our allies. They are aware that the Soviet Union finds itself in a precrisis state, and the very existence of such a large, strong, and multinational state as the Soviet Union does not suit certain people. Certain people would like our internal national boundaries to begin shifting and our external boundaries in the west and in the east to begin shifting as well. It is not fortuitous that a prominent West European politician recently warned his colleagues that what needs modernizing now are not weapons but first and foremost their way of thinking. I think that this modernization will take place more rapidly if our restructuring process is faster and more successful and if our country more energetically breaks out of its stagnation and backwardness, gaining new strength, both moral and material. If this does not occur, the consequences for us will be grave.

In this respect, the development of our economy, the success of economic reform, and the ever broader involvement of the Soviet Union in the international division of labor on a new basis are of decisive importance. Surely the time is approaching to begin the extensive democratization of the policy of socialist integration. Without it—that is, without such integration—we shall have no genuine integration and we shall not obtain the tremendous economic, political, and social effect that is potentially contained in it. If we have no genuine integration, more and more European states may begin to be sucked into the EEC and via the EEC into NATO—that is, there may be the construction of an all-European branch of NATO and no development in the direction of the equal and constructive cooperation of the two systems on an all-European basis. This is a real danger.

Deep and pleasing changes are beginning in our relations with the socialist countries. This was noted in the report. Intersocialist relations are more and more energetically being filled with life and are acquiring new dynamism. An important stage in this process, for instance, might be the creation of a parliament of the socialist community elected by the populations of the CEMA countries by direct elections. It could discuss on a broad democratic basis the main questions relating to the acceleration and improvement of socialist integration processes. It could also submit appropriate recommendations and proposals to the governments of CEMA member countries, the political consultative committee of the Warsaw Pact and its bodies, and finally to CEMA itself, monitoring its work.

Comrades, the separation of functions between party and state bodies will have the consequence of enhancing the responsibility, efficiency, and authority of our state bodies not only inside our country but abroad as well. It is necessary to ponder how justified it is to have a government consisting of almost 80 to 100 ministers. I do not know what it is like for our leadership, but in this labyrinth our Western partners are often unable to find either the ways in or the ways out. I am afraid ambassadors are also unable to do this. [applause] This state of affairs does not exist in any other country. It gives rise to many perplexed questions about the role our government and about the status and real powers of its members. Evidently, the rank of minister has been devalued during the postwar years, and at the same time, the status of our government has also been devalued. Often, the government has been perceived as an enormous economic ministry.

The increased economic independence of our enterprises and indeed the whole strategy of our economic restructuring raise the question of whether the present system of government bodies in its present form is expedient. As the new state mechanism takes shape, would it not be better to have several dozen powerful socialist trusts and syndicates with a much smaller number of producing ministries? Surely, this could help to overcome the command methods of administration of our state bodies and facilitate their transition to making greater use of econmomic levers and increasing the efficiency of our state machine as a whole. [end recording]

Comments on Bloc Parliament

PM0407122188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 88 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the FRG, at the 1 July evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Dear Comrades! As you know, there have been profound revolutionary changes in our foreign policy since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum. Their essence, like the essence of all our policy, must consist in strengthening the poositions of socialism, finding new opportunities, and influencing the course of international development.

There have been undoubted successes in this area. It is not so much a case of our relations improving with many countries and deteriorating with none during the years of restructuring. Something else is important: The eyes of the entire world, politicians of any bent, business circles, and public organizations are focused once more on Moscow, just as they were in the stormy post-October years. Hopes of resolving the greatest problems of the day are linked in the minds of an increasingly large number of people abroad with our country and our new policy. This is not merely a tactical success. A qualitative change has emerged.

We have taken the initiative internationally, and are holding on to it. The popularity of the Soviet Union and its leadership has risen sharply. The potential for popular sympathy with our people, rooted in age-old common history, culture, and traditions, has been aroused once more. This potential was weighed down by the accretions of the personality cult and later by the period of stagnation. After all, we were only bringing a fairly small portion of our available reserves to bear on questions of

reducing arms with effective verification, seeking political solutions to the most pressing regional conflicts, and resolutely galvanizing our policy in Europe and the Asia-Pacific and other regions. The same was true concerning our new approaches to humanitarian problems, and the greater openness of our foreign policy on the whole.

We must continue this vigorously. We do not need debates on the imaginary stratification within our leadership over the continuation of restructuring. As in domestic policy, we have no way to go back over or around restructuring. Were we to do so, we would lose the trust we have gained and the initiative as well.

A great deal has been set in motion in foreign policy under the influence of the CPSU initiatives. There is great interest in us. However, it would be wrong to think of it as only friendly interest. That is why, although we have proclaimed and are implementing the new thinking in international affairs, it has by no means become the dominant force in interstate relations in the modern world. Its establishment is a question of fierce struggle, which will take a comparatively long time and will require great and strenuous effort.

Comrades, everything isn't rosy. There are many politicians abroad who, while expressing verbal interest in or even a friendly attitude toward restructuring, are actually counting on it in order to implement all sorts of musty plans to displace socialism and achieve their territorial-political and other ambitions with regard to us and our allies. They know that the Soviet Union was in a precrisis state. Some do not like the very existence of such a large and mighty multiethnic state as the Soviet Union. Some would like our internal national borders to be movable, and would like to see our international borders in the East and West start to shift.

It is no coincidence that a leading West European politician warned his colleagues recently that it isn't weapons that need modernization, but their way of thinking. I think that the quicker and more successful our restructuring is and the more vigorously our country breaks out of stagnation and backwardness by gathering new momentum—both moral and material—the faster this modernization will occur. If this does not happen, the consequences for us will be serious.

In this context, the development of our economy, the success of the economic reform, and the Soviet Union's increasingly extensive involvement in the international division of labor on a new basis is of decisive significance. That has already been mentioned here. I am now talking about the foreign policy side of the question. Unfortunately, this process is unfolding only slowly. The problems of the economic reform are being reflected naturally and, I would say, in a concentrated way, on our position in foreign markets.

Of course, we are at the very start of the road. But the continuing structural uniformity of our export system continues to make the Soviet Union heavily dependent on the unstable state of the world market for energy sources and other primary products. There has been no substantial increase in the sale of machines, equipment, and other high-tech goods given the technological lag of Soviet industry and the overall low quality of our finished articles. This fact is widely known. Comrades, it is embarrassing to say this, but to sell Soviet goods, we sometimes have to remove the "Made in USSR" stamp. Frequently, there are insufficient stocks of commodities in demand on local markets. In sum, out of the R5 billion in trade with the FRG, no more than R50 million comes from the export of our machines, equipment, and transport systems. That share is paltry.

We continue to pay for our purchases in the FRG almost entirely through the export of irreplaceable natural resources—oil, gas, timber, and diamonds. Our economic ties with other developed countries tell the same story. It is not only grain, which is in short supply in the country, that we continue to import in exchange for currency. The same is true of metals, and our production is greater than that of the United States. Clearly, immediate measures could also be taken here. The creation of joint ventures and the development of cooperative ties with foreign partners, which would allow us to turn out our own technology and become accustomed to producing competitive modern output both for our own needs and for export, is more of an episode at the present time than a broadly developed and well-organized practice. Our actions here are far from systematic, and there is no well thought out strategy in sight.

It is quite obvious that we need a drastic economic breakthrough if restructuring is not to run out of steam both within the country and in foreign policy. Resolute measures at the present crucial period require a firm and purposeful party leadership. Unfortunately for us, such purposefulness, firmness, and consistency have been lacking. Old structures got in the way. Political reform was needed. This is now moot with M.S. Gorbachev's speech. I want to stress the urgency of this question.

A state's position in the modern world is determined by a combination of factors, the most important of which is economic might. Incidentally, this is used every day by the other side to resolve foreign policy tasks. At any rate, it is used more often than military strength. Many countries know this from bitter experience. That is why a reduction in our military potential must without fail be combined with adequate growth in the country's economic potential. It must keep pace with it. Otherwise, there could be a loss of influence [substantsiya].

The following point also arises: In competition with the capitalist world, we have secured parity in the military sphere at the cost of years of effort and tremendous expense. The nuclear arms race is deadlocked, which has made it possible to begin major physical nuclear arms

reductions. This has also made it possible for the Soviet Union to pose the question of the complete elimination of such weapons and the question of reducing surplus military might in general. That was a tremendous historic success for Soviet foreign policy.

However, as is well known, we have, for a number of reasons, been unable to simultaneously secure parity in another area—the economic sphere. This, moreover, is a force that is often no less effective and formidable than weapons. Therefore, while taking emergency measures to boost the country's economy, we must also bring political resources into play. For instance, we must raise, energetically and repeatedly, questions concerning a ban on the abuse of economic might or the threat of its use in international relations. We must also raise the idea of establishing the appropriate international control over the use of economic levers in relations between states, and the transfer of surplus economic resources in excess of the normal requirements of a state and its people to meet the needs of the entire international community. The development of this process, along with that of disarmament, would ensure greater stability for the international political climate and would be a major step toward genuine democratization and confidence-building in relations between states.

The acceleration and deepening of the process of integration, especially in Western Europe, is one of the important factors on the international scene. EEC countries have set themselves the task of creating a single internal market by 1992. The process of their political and military integration is also taking great strides forward. A substantial change in the alignment of forces is imminent. The Soviet Union is taking these realities into consideration and is drawing conclusions from them in its approach to the EEC. It has established relations with it.

A great deal will depend on what this organization itself wants to be—an additional prop for the NATO bloc in Europe or a factor in the new European thinking and the building of a common European home. A great deal will depend on us here. It is no secret that socialist integration lags behind Western integration in terms of pace, volume, aims, and results. At present it increasingly remains the adjunct of the CEMA apparatus and other administrative organs; it has not become a cause dear to ordinary people in socialist countries and is increasingly far removed from their daily interests and questions. Here, as in other spheres, the socialist citizen has become alienated from socialist policy. There is no initiative and control by the masses and there is a lack of feedback between management mechanisms and citizens.

Probably, the time is approaching to also begin broad democratization in the policy of socialist integration. Without it, that is, without such integration, we will have no true integration nor the huge economic, political, and social effect which is potentially invested in it. We will have no true integration; as such, EEC and NATO via the EEC may begin to "absorb" more and more European states. In other words, they may construct an all-European branch of the North Atlantic bloc rather than develop equitable and constructive cooperation between the two systems on an all-European basis. This is a real danger.

The report has pointed out that profound gratifying changes are beginning in our relations with socialist countries. Intersocialist ties are being revitalized with increasing vigor and are taking on new dynamics. The setting up of a socialist community parliament elected by the CEMA countries' populations through direct elections, for instance, could be an important phase in this process. It could discuss on a broad democratic basis basic questions of accelerating and improving socialist integration processes, submit the appropriate recommendations and proposals to CEMA countries' governments, the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, its organs, and, last, to CEMA, and could monitor their work.

Relations with developing countries remain a major issue in our foreign policy. This subject is vast. A great deal has been done during the years of restructuring. That is why I only want to mention one thing: This avenue of our policy cannot remain primarily cost-based. The rush of the previous period to implement various theoretical socioeconomic plans frequently led to lamentable results and the disorganization and destruction of traditional production units in developing countries, while at the same time our aid was used to erect costly industrial monuments to bad management there. During the years of stagnation, socialist orientation began to be increasingly associated in people's minds with economic difficulties. And, in turn, we in the Soviet Union are experiencing a shortage of coffee and tropical fruits at a time when the markets of Western states are bursting with them. Yet we are investing billions in aid to those developing countries which can produce and traditionally always did produce those products.

It is our duty to offer developing states selfless aid. This is indisputable. But the current situation is unnatural. It must be rectified in our own interests and in the interests of the states with which we cooperate.

Comrades! The separation of functions between party and state organs will result in enhancing the responsibility, efficiency, and prestige of our state organs not only within the country but also abroad. In this connection I want to continue the topic begun by Comrade Kabaidze. We must think about how justifiable it is to have a government consisting of almost 80 or 100 ministers. I do not know about our leadership, but our Western partners often cannot find their way in or out of this labyrinth. I am sorry to say that sometimes our ambassadors are in the same position. (Applause)

No other country has this number of ministers. This provokes many bewildered questions about the role of our government and the status and real powers of its members. Evidently, during the postwar years the rank of minister was devalued, as was at the same time the status of our government, which was often perceived as a huge ministry of the economy.

Enhancing the economic independence of enterprises and the entire strategy of our economic restructuring brings us to the question of whether the present system of state organs is suitable in its current form. Would it not be better as a new state mechanism emerges to have several dozen powerful socialist trusts and syndicates with a much smaller number of industrial ministries? This would, probably, also help to overcome the method of administrative edict used by our state bodies and enable them to switch to greater use of economic levers and to increasing the efficiency of our state machinery as a whole.

In conclusion, allow me to express my full support for the provisions of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report. They are dictated by profound concern for the fate of our people and for the prosperity and greatness of our motherland. I can say without exaggeration that the report and its ideas and our conference, its decisions, and conclusions will rock the whole world.

Communists and workers in the foreign service who are resolving the tasks facing them in conditions of daily acute competition with a different system can now say with confidence that our country, despite all the difficulties, is on the right road. Restructuring must and will advance and develop in breadth and in depth. We will devote our efforts, our knowledge, and our energy to this. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

Turkmen Chief Niyazov's Speech

PM0307103588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 11-12

[Speech by S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee, at 1 July evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades! I first want to answer Comrade Surkov, the Moscow plant worker who spoke before the break. Unfortunately, I do not know his first name or patronymic. He said that there is nepotism in the party leadership. It truly hurt to hear this comrade; perhaps, he has been somewhat misled. In this regard, I would like to say a few words about myself.

I grew up in a children's home—my father was killed at the front and my mother and two brothers were killed in an earthquake. I graduated from school and then from the Leningrad Polytechnical Institute, and I worked as an electrical fitter and foreman. I have been engaged in party work since 1970. After the April Plenum, I was entrusted with heading Turkmenistan's party organization. (applause) I say this to show that there are now tens of thousands of people like me in the party. And such an expression at the conference cuts all party workers to the quick. I think that he may have said it without realizing.

M.S. Gorbachev: No, Comrade Niyazov. Here we have to look at everything objectively, after all. Indeed, there has already been a great deal of renewal, but clearly, comrades also encounter other cases. Probably, both kinds of case currently exist. But, after all, a real-life process is under way with all its contradictions. That is probably why complaints arise.

S.A. Niyazov: I am not complaining, Mikhail Sergeyevich, I am prepared to meet with him, talk with him, and discuss the work we are doing. (laughter) I just wanted to make clear that we are engaged in considerable renewal. And today the work of our conference, which is taking place in an atmosphere of professionalism and free and frank discussions on the questions of restructuring strategy and tactics, is a lesson in Leninist democracy.

We listened attentively to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, and each evening our delegation has met to discuss it. Our unanimous opinion is that the report is magnificent. It makes a principled assessment of the first results of the fulfillment of the April Central Committee Plenum and the 27th party congress. It also defines a large-scale program for the consistent implementation of the radical economic reform and the full renewal of intraparty democracy and of all spheres of our society's life.

For Turkmenia and its party organization, restructuring is largely linked with overcoming the distorted phenomena of the recent past that were rightly criticized at the 27th CPSU Congress. Embezzlement, overreporting, window-dressing, corruption, and the demoralization of some leading cadres seriously undermined party organizations' prestige and people's belief in justice. We often repeat this and, clearly, will go on repeating it until these phenomena are completely eradicated from our sociopolitical life. Consulting with healthy forces in the republic's party aktiv, we submitted these questions to a plenum of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee. An extremely open and principled discussion was held, the sources of stagnant phenomena were revealed, and a party assessment was made of the incorrect actions of many leaders guilty of such phenomena. The plenum expelled the first secretary and two other secretaries of Tashauz party obkom and the chairman of the Tashauz Oblispolkom from the CPSU. At the party meetings that followed the party committee sessions, 1,380 leading workers were severely censured by the party and relieved of their duties. The clean-out also touched the republic's top leading organs. Thirty-one people were expelled from the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee. The removal of deputyships from 80 leading workers out of the 330 deputies to the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet was a necessary measure. The same process of

purification, as is well known, is under way in other parts of the country. That is why it seems right to us for the conference resolution to reflect the fact that the removal of the obstacles in the way of restructuring and the acceleration of the process of society's renewal require the building up of efforts, the strengthening of social justice, and a struggle against violations of Soviet laws as well as the norms and principles of our morality. In this connection, we support the report provision on the partial renewal of the Central Committee in the period between congresses. Decisions on this score should be made by a majority after a secret ballot. Clearly, this provision could also be extended to local party committees. The work to instill order, strengthen discipline, and step up demands on cadres has produced certain improvements in the economy and the moral and political situation in the republic. According to preliminary figures, in the last 2 and ½ years national income growth rates have equaled the growth of the entire last 5-year plan.

The party's course of revealing the potential of kolkhozes and sovkhozes in every possible way through the development of various forms of contract is producing tangible results. More than 48,000 families working 22 percent of our irrigated land are currently working on family or lease contracts in the republic. It is largely thanks to them that gross agricultural output has grown by 11 percent and labor productivity by 9 percent, and the profitability of agricultural produce has reached 40 percent for the first time. Net profit has increased 50 percent. Capital investment to develop the social sphere has increased considerably, and the target for the construction of housing, schools, preschool establishments, and hospitals has been overfulfilled.

These accomplishments, however, give no grounds for complacency. We still have too many unresolved problems and unutilized reserves. The general difficulties in implementing the radical economic reform are also complicated by issues specific to our region. The high population growth rates, the imbalance in favor of extracting sectors in the industrial structure, and the neglect of the social sphere are having an acute effect on the sociopolitical situation in the republic. We can also see that a considerable number of cadres are maintaining their adherence to the passive and compliant work style that took shape in previous years. Some of them are simply sitting on the fence without defining their position in restructuring. Democratic institutions in cadre work are still not working fully. The promotion of new-type leaders who are competent, vigorous, incisive, able to convince others, and capable of achieving high end results is proceeding with great difficulty. That is why we wholly support the ideas expressed in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report and the conference delegate speeches to the effect that without a radical break with conservative and bureaucratic leadership methods it will be impossible to successfully progress any further. In this connection the central question is that of the role and place of the CPSU in Soviet society's political system and the clear delineation of the functions of party, soviet, and economic organs and social organizations. The delegates from our party organization unequivocally support the provision that discussions and the quest for society's renewal can only be conducted on the road of building socialism and on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory. There is no other reliable, tried, and tested ideology and theory that reflects the fundamental interests of the working class and all working people. Nor is there any need to seek any other party as an alternative to the CPSU.

The delegates from the Turkmen SSR unanimously support the proposal that first secretaries, from rayon party committees right up to the Central Committee, be soviet chairmen simultaneously. The restructuring of soviets' activity proposed in the report and the democratization of the electoral system create real opportunities for enhancing the role of soviet and economic organs in the direct leadership of the economy and the resolution of social issues.

Comrades, the enhancement of the soviets' role and the full restoration of their powers and real authority will, in our view, have a favorable impact on such an important matter as the improvement of national relations. These are based on the correct and fair satisfaction of the economic, political, and cultural interests and needs of various nations and ethnic groups.

In the past, national interests were often ignored and sometimes even infringed upon against a background of outward prosperity, ostentatious speeches, and bromides. The water problem is a most acute problem under the conditions of the Central Asia region. For the past decade, contrary to all justice and with the support of high authorities, violations have been permitted in the distribution of water resources; these were kept secret from the people, and the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources as coordinator was on the side of the strong. This had a detrimental effect on people's morale and did not promote the strengthening of friendship and good-neighborly relations between republics. Only in the post-April period have water resources been distributed democratically and fairly, and this has promoted an improvement in moral relations between the populations of fraternal republics.

Or here is another example. More than 40 percent of total industrial production in Turkmenistan is made up of output from all-union enterprises. Last year, they contributed just R500,000 to the budget of local soviets; they contributed R530 million to the budget of union ministries, while at the same time subsidies from the all-union fund to the republic's budget amounted to R344 million.

The situation with the budgets of most oblast and rayon soviets is similar. The distribution of almost all enterprise profits via all-union funds reduces the interest of local soviets in their successful work and gives rise to

parasitical sentiments. In this regard, we approve the proposals contained in the report that enterprises and economic organizations located in a certain territory should expand their contributions to the budgets of local soviets.

Comrades, the questions of the further development and improvement of interethnic relations should not be divorced from history or from what has been gained in the 70 years since October. The principles of the nationalities policy devised by Lenin are an invaluable achievement of our party and people. Thanks to their practical implementation we have every reason to refer today to the economic and cultural upsurge achieved by Turkmenistan in the years of Soviet power—an achievement that would have been inconceivable under different conditions. Interethnic strife, mistrust, suspicion, and the offense felt by non-Russians [inorodtsy] in the great-power nation, of which Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote, have been overcome.

The Turkmen people have repeatedly seen for themselves the great selflessness, expansiveness of soul, and truly fraternal r lations between the Russian people and the other peoples of the USSR. Our people's hearts and minds will always recall the plants and factories of the first 5-year plans, the restoration of earthquake-hit Ashkhabad, the building of the Kara-Kum Canal, and the opening up of oil and gas fields. Nor should we forget the lessons of the past. Unity and the fraternal friendship of the peoples saved us in the Civil War years and helped to overcome backwardness and devastation and to win the struggle against fascism. That is why people in the republic were pained to hear about the well-known events in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

In this regard, it seems necessary to introduce into the USSR Constitution reliable guarantees against similar infringements upon the fraternal friendship and unity of the USSR peoples. (applause)

Comrades, restructuring in all areas has shaken up our republic. Restructuring as a way of thinking and acting is entering its life more and more deeply, defining the nature of social awareness and our entire practical activity. We are not idealizers, of course. The time when everything was seen through rose-colored glasses is over. We will still have to do a great deal of work to make up what has been lost. This will be promoted by the practical implementation of the common task of economic reform and reform of the political system.

The Turkmen Communist Party delegation is instructed to assure you that Communists and all working people in the republic have accepted heart and soul the idea of restructuring. Working to implement it, we are convinced that the decisions of the 19th all-union party conference will make revolutionary restructuring irreversible and serve as a powerful accelerator of our society's forward progress down the Leninist road. Thank you. (applause)

PRAVDA's Afanasyev Address

LD0107192988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1612 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Speech by V.G. Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA, at the 1 July session of the the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Text] A few words on the topic of Boris Nikolayevich's [Yeltsin] statement. I must say that his speech today differed sharply...[changes thought] that speech was muddled, very, very confused, and incomprehensible, and it was natural for the party Central Committee plenum to make the only possible decision.

Now, the press. We journalists were put somewhat on our guard by the fact that the Theses say virtually nothing about the press. Very little is said in the resolutions we are to adopt, either. Only the resolution on glasnost has a little to say. I don't know if anything can be amended. I think this opportunity does exist, since in the report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev there is both an evaluation and an analysis of the work of our press. The shortcomings are indicated and the tasks and prospects for our development are revealed.

I will not repeat the words of the report that contain the evaluation of the work of the press; it is generally positive. The press has done much to restore historical truth and social justice and for criticism—criticism of our shortcomings and omissions and on a whole series of other issues. The press will criticize party and other workers. It will show how they work, what they are doing, the mistakes, the shortcomings, what positive experience there is in their work. We will also show the face of party workers.

Take, for example, the week that preceded our conference, in PRAVDA, from 20 to 26 June. There were nine articles there on the party theme and, what's more, they were under two headings: "The Party Committee" and "A Word About the Party Worker." The subject of the party and its vanguard role in our society, party unity and the style and methods of its work have been and will remain the principal topics of our party press. And then, we are not merely working only on the basis of information from our correspondents and our own staff but we are working with you. You are working with us. You write for us. It is the joint work of ourselves and you, party and economic workers. We have an enormous writers' aktiv and we are trying to make use of it. Our task is to look for what are now commonly called the foremen of restructuring [prorabov perestroyki] and to defend those who, in one form or another, and to one degree or another, are being pressured and persecuted. Let us say that there are not a few delegates to our conference among them. One of them is sitting there in

the Presidium. He, too, was threatened with grave danger, but the matter was terminated because our party's Central Committee and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev supported him. [applause]

The last thing on which I would like to dwell, to say a few words about, is that by no means do we journalists have everything in our own house in order. There is still a mass of dull, routine material, elements of bias and prejudice, inadequacy and incompetence and, to put it bluntly, you do encounter lies. Our fight against this phenomenon is not always enough, but we have encountered new phenomena and we must somehow react more rapidly, more urgently to all these things. I do not know whether mistakes are inevitable or whether they can be avoided completely, but our task is to make as few as possible.

Afanasyev Speech Published

PM0207233588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 12

[Speech by V.G. Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA, at the 1 July evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] A few words about Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's statement. I must say that his speech today differed greatly from what he said at the October plenum. It is possible to agree and to argue with and to discuss today's speech, part of it, at least. The other speech was confused, very, very muddled and incomprehensible, and it was natural for the party Central Committee plenum to adopt the only possible and correct decision.

Not to mention what Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev said about Yeltsin as a man, as a party official, one must remember that we simply cannot pose the question of his political rehabilitation for purely formal reasons. There are 5,000 of us here, while there were, perhaps, 400 people at the plenum. You did not hear his plenum speech and therefore cannot judge, and we are simply not empowered to decide this question (a stir in the hall).

Now about the press. We journalists were put somewhat on guard by the fact that the Theses have virtually nothing to say about the press. And very little is said in the drafts of the resolutions which we are to adopt. A little is said only in the glasnost resolution. I don't know if anything can be amended; I believe this is possible, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report evaluated and analyzed the work of our press, showed the shortcomings, and disclosed the tasks and prospects of our development.

I will not repeat the words of the report that deal with the evaluation and contain an evaluation of the work of the press; it is generally positive. The press has done much to restore the historical truth, for social justice and for criticism of our shortcomings and oversights and to illustrate a whole range of other questions. Were I chairing this session, I would ask: Dear comrade delegates, do you agree with this evaluation? I believe that perhaps not a single hand would be raised in objection. Nonetheless, I am disturbed by the question: Why does there hover in this hall some, I would say, pronounced dislike of the press and those working in it? (Stir) There's no need to hurry with your conclusions; take your time. After all, many speakers have tried, in one way or another, to somehow wound, somehow sting, somehow criticize the press.

M.S. Gorbachev: Viktor Grigoryevich, have we gotten to the press?

V.G. Afanasyev: We have. We have and rightly so.

M.S. Gorbachev: There are no zones off-limits to criticism now. (Laughter, applause)

V.G. Afanasyev: No. And as far as criticism of the press is concerned, there will surely be applause here for this. However, we are now accustomed to this applause and are drawing serious conclusions from it. We are restructuring ourselves, although it cannot yet be said that we have completed the restructuring.

We have no political opposition, nor could we for well-known reasons, mainly the fact that there is no social or class basis for it. But the press is and, I will be so bold as to assure you, it will remain the socialist opposition. It will criticize party and other officials. It will show how they work, what they are doing, what mistakes and shortcomings they are allowing to occur, and what the positive experience of their work is.

Take, for example, the week preceding our conference—20-26 June. PRAVDA carried nine articles on party topics in two columns, "The Party Committee" and "About the Party Official." The subject of the party, the subject of its vanguard role in our society, the subject of party unity and the style and methods of its work have been and remain the principal topics of the party press. And there is no point in saying that people working in the press cannot judge the work of party authorities. Since when have people working in the party press ceased to be party workers? Here at PRAVDA we have people who were directly involved in party work for many years, who have been working in the party life department for 25 or 30 years, and not working on the basis of information from our correspondents and employees. You and I are working together, you write for us, you provide us with material so that the work of the press is joint work with party, soviet, and management workers. We have a tremendous group of authors and we try to make efficient use of it.

What are the basic tasks of the press under restructuring?

The first task is, of course, that of criticism, the task of determining shortcomings, mistakes, and miscalculations and of searching for ways to get rid of them. This is

a very difficult task; I would even call it a risky one. I remember the racket over the material from Bashkiria "Stop the Persecution." We suffered a great deal of unpleasantness. Only when the Central Committee went there and confirmed everything that had been written did things become a little quieter for us.

There have been many such articles, and in light of some of them, party decisions, party Central Committee decisions, have been adopted. But journalists often pay a high price for this. We carried the article "The Return," for instance. It was about the Starodubets brothers from Tula Oblast. We had a very big battle with the local party authorities; it was hard to operate. As a result, our correspondent V. Shvetsov suffered three heart attacks and is now a class two invalid. So, you see, our work is not the easiest.

The second task is to search for the work superintendents of restructuring, as it is now customary to call them, and the protection of those who in one form or another, and to one degree or another, are being hampered and persecuted. This group includes many of the delegates to our conference. One of them, the well-known construction worker N. Travkin, was threatened with serious danger, but all ended well because our party's Central Committee, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and the newspaper supported him.

And our third, most important, task is to look for and help the party in its search for constructive solutions. Criticism is important, of course, we cannot live and work without it; it is our air. But criticism alone is, for all that, not enough, and the report of our party's general secretary emphasized in a particularly forceful way that the most important thing is a quest for progressive experience and constructive solutions. This means not only the formulation of problems but an analysis and solution of them, as well. (Applause)

Here we are experiencing a certain material crisis. The press is the mirror of party work, the mirror of the party organizations. Naturally, we write about what is being done in the party organizations and have no right to think up anything out of place. Therefore, the appeal and request to you is: Let us work together precisely on the search and support for and the dissemination of everything positive that can be found in our work. Of course, we are searching inadequately as yet, and do not yet know how to seek out and solve the new problems which restructuring places before us. I could list dozens of such problems. We are still incompetent in some respects, but we are trying to fill the gaps in our knowledge. We are building up experience, positive experience, and will disseminate it together with you. (Applause)

I would like to say that by no means do we journalists have everything in own house in order. There is still a great deal of dull, marginal material, along with one-sidedness, bias, inaccuracies, incompetence, and, to put it bluntly, you do encounter lies. Our fight against these things is not always enough, and we must respond more rapidly and promptly to all of them. I do not know whether mistakes are inevitable, whether they can be avoided at all, but it is our job to make as few as possible, better still, not to make any at all.

One speaker mentioned several names, including mine, as being among the virtual pioneers of stagnation. That, I believe, was an irresponsible statement. This is not some sort of court or certification commission. Speaking without proof, baselessly, is impermissible for a party official.

A great deal of work lies ahead of us. Let us cooperate and help one another. We have a common cause. Let us work together. (Applause)

Volkov Defends Yeltsin

PM0207140788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 12

[Speech by V.A. Volkov, party committee secretary at the Kalinin Machine Building Plant, Sverdlovsk City, at the 1 July evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] I think I would not be the only one with a heavy heart if everything were to remain it was after Comrade Ligachev's speech about Yeltsin.

Yes, Yeltsin is a very difficult man with a difficult character. He is a tough man, perhaps even cruel. But this leader, when he worked in the Sverdlovsk Oblast party organization, did a very great deal for the prestige of the party worker and for the party, and he was a man who kept his word. Therefore, even today, in the eyes of ordinary people, he remains a man of high standing.

I believe that the party Central Committee has damaged its own prestige by not publishing the materials from the October plenum. (Applause) That has given rise to a mass of misinterpretations that have merely hurt the cause.

Nor do I agree with Comrade Ligachev's statement about food coupons [kartochki]. Unfortunately, the situation regarding food products today is not what it was in Yeltsin's time.

Our oblast occupies third place (of course, I may perhaps, be mistaken, but it is somewhere around third place) in Russia in terms of the volume of industrial output. However, in proportional terms, our rural population is very small in comparison with other oblasts.

What else do I want to say? We are not familiar with Yeltsin's speech at the October plenum. As such, it is difficult for us to make a decision today about rehabilitation and about amending the assessment made by the Central Committee plenum. All the same, we shouldn't be sticking labels on people.

In his speech, for all intents and purposes, Comrade Yeltsin raised the majority of those issues that were heard in preceding speeches—a great many of them, anyway. Therefore, I want to say once again (and I think, the members of the Sverdlovsk delegation will support me), that Yeltsin has done a great deal for Sverdlovsk Oblast, where even today his prestige is very high. (Applause)

Chikirev Attacks Yeltsin's Record

PM0307151588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 12

[Speech by N.S. Chikirev, general director of the Sergo Ordzhonikidze "Stankostroitelnyy Zavod" Science and Production Association, at the 1 July evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] I have been in the party since 1946. I have been at my plant since I was 15 and have been going in through the same entrance for 46 years. I have been in the party since 1946, but never before had we had such a secretary of the Moscow party gorkom.

I have never met with Yegor Kuzmich or even shaken his hand. The same is true of Mikhail Sergeyevich.

M.S. Gorbachev: Is that a criticism? OK, we accept it, we accept it.

N.S. Chikirev: When Comrade Yeltsin arrived in Moscow he was very well received. He was received with great support and attention. We saw his diligence when he toured plants and factories. We saw that he really wanted products to be available in Moscow and that he wanted us to work better.

He spent 6 hours at my plant and made a single observation, which I consider absolutely unfair. I do not want to repeat it because it was absolutely incompetent—he saw someone for the first time in his life and said something he had no right to say. That is one thing.

I think the collective in which I grew up knows me better than Comrade Yeltsin.

New raykom personnel and leaders were elected at the last rayon party conferences. Comrade Yeltsin was elected to the Moscow Gorkom shortly before. All secretaries of the party raykoms—and this is not my first term as a gorkom member, I have worked for many years in the Komsomol and the party—were elected under Comrade Yeltsin. In a very short time, just a year, he had replaced 23 of the 33 first secretaries with the help of his toady in the organizational department. I do not think Comrade Yeltsin was so perceptive as to be able to get to know the secretaries in 6 months and dump so many of them. That is one point.

And here is another: If he talked to us today about 1937, then my family has also endured a great deal. There was a party raykom secretary who grew up among us, a supremely honest and conscientious person, and he jumped out of a window after an undeserved reprimand for doing a poor job of supplying the rayon with food. However, it is not very easy to organize this in Kiyevskiy Rayon. Two trains would arrive at Kiyevskiy Station in the morning, and Kiyevskiy Rayon would again be without food. So just try organizing supplies in Kiyevskiy Rayon. I live right by this rayon. The gorkom bureau investigated, issued a "severe reprimand," and the comrade jumped from the eighth story. So died a supremely honest man, someone Moscow knew, someone we party gorkom members knew, someone the raykom secretaries knew. How is that better than 1937? This man was not a Shchelokov or a Rashidov. He was a Communist, a devoted Communist. I hope Comrade Yeltsin has this death on his conscience. (Applause)

Lukin Attacks Yeltsin

PM0307135188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 12

[Speech by I.S. Lukin, first secretary of Proletarskiy Raykom, Moscow, at the 1 July evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrades, I have no right not to speak out on behalf of the Moscow party organization regarding the speech by the delegate from Sverdlovsk. I am a young first secretary—I was only elected a little over a year ago—and I cannot claim to be among those whom Comrade Yeltsin has offended. But, judging by certain speeches from this very rostrum and certain, as I see it, rather immature bursts of applause, I feel that some people are still mesmerized by Yeltsin's phrases.

When I heard him in 1984 at a scientific and practical conference (I was in the auditorium, he was in the presidium) I, too, thought he was, so to speak, an exciting speaker and an interesting man. But now that hypnotic spell has been broken. Under your leadership, Comrade Yeltsin, the city party organization encountered your working style and methods.

I am convinced that the attempt to force the pace of restructuring led to a virtual breakdown of the party organization in Moscow. Speaking about yourself, you talked about the "shadow of the distant past." But weren't your methods of working with cadres in Moscow—party members above all—a "shadow of the distant past"? The first secretaries of Kuybyshevskiy, Kiyevskiy, Leningradskiy, and many other party raykoms not only left, but were, for all intents and purposes, broken and spiritually destroyed. Your callous attitude toward people could be seen in the endless replacement of cadres. My predecessor, an honorable and upright man, was also forced to leave. His health couldn't take it.

As far as the city's economic life is concerned, we are still cleaning up the mess caused by your desire to be known for your wonderful promises to Muscovites. However, the main thing about your style was your desire to please the masses. You chose just one method—driving a wedge between party committees on one hand, and the working class and intelligentsia on the other. That is what you did in Moscow and that is what you tried to do today, for all intents and proposes driving a wedge between the conference delegates, the auditorium, and the presidium. In that, Comrade Yeltsin, you won't succeed. It won't wash!

Today people have been talking about Comrade Yeltsin's speech at the CPSU Central Committee October (1987) Plenum. Yes, not everyone heard that address. But let us ask in a human and party-minded fashion: Is it fitting for a Communist to make such statements on the eve of the visit to the United States by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee? What is he, a new boy in our party or what?

Or take his interview with American and other foreign radio stations. You see, he took umbrage at OGONEK and APN. Is that fitting for a Communist? I don't think it would be fitting for someone who had only been in the party for a month, let alone a party leader and member of the CPSU Central Committee. (Applause)

Comrades, I am convinced that it is too early today to talk about political rehabilitation. It is clear, Comrade Yeltsin, that you have yet to draw any conclusions. I am also convinced that our delegates will be able to recognize a pretty phrase in any wrapping and a desire to express one's own arrogance. And our conference today is the guarantee of that. (Applause)

Gorbachev Concluding Speech

LD0107212088 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 1 Jul 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 1 July concluding session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference—recorded]

[Text] Comrades, our conference is ending its work. The documents that have just been adopted on the results of the discussions—the discussion itself, and 31 delegates also took part in it—relieve me from the need to make lenghty concluding remarks on the results of our conference. Nonetheless our conference is an event on such a scale that there is a need to assess the work that has been done by us over the past 4 days on the basis of the strictest possible yardsticks. This is necessary not to pay tribute to traditions that were current in the past, of expressing praise for every regular party forum. It is necessary, I think for us ourselves to understand the place of the 19th party conference in the life of the party and the country. A major event has occurred in the history of our party [applause]

First and foremost, about the atmosphere of the discussion that has taken place. It was a genuine, open talk in a party spirit about the main thing that is of concern today to Communists and Soviet people, and an attempt to find answers to the issues that are worrying them. The Palace of Congresses has not seen such a meeting before, comrades, and I think that we would not be doing any wrong to the truth in saying that we have not seen anything of this kind for almost 6 decades. [applause] In this sense we are entitled to say that the conference has passed off in the Leninist spirit and the spirit of Leninism. The spirit of lofty Leninist responsibility before the people and the revolution has triumphed. [applause]

That one fact lends it special significance. One cannot fail to have noted the delegates' extremely high level of activity. We, it must be said, found ourselves in a difficult position: Just the number of people who put their names down was around 300. Regretably, not all could speak, but in some measure the need for their views to be expressed found an outlet at the sessions of the drafting commissions; I told you that around 150 people were able to speak there. This is a new form of work for us, in which almost a tenth of all conference delegates took part. It made it possible for business-like consideration to be given to the many specific questions which arose during the discussions, and for solutions to be found to them. A spirit of exactingness, great exactingness, reigned at the conference. I would even specify that the way in which questions were posed was robust and principled. At the same time there was a spirit of party comradeship, one might even say of amicability toward one another. This is also an example for the whole party and for the whole of our society. [applause]

That is how it should be among people of like mind, people who have undertaken the great cause of restructuring, the renewal of our society, and who feel the presence behind them of hundreds, thousands, and millions of their party comrades, and all Soviet people, who followed the progress of our work with enormous interest. In that sense the conference—I think one can put it this way—reflected the political atmosphere which is being affirmed in our country, and demonstrated the level of democratic development attained by the party—and not just by the party, but by the whole of Soviet society—in the last 3-and-a-bit years since the April plenum of the party's Central Committee.

And now a word about the content of our work. Its main result is the fact that on all the fundamental issues which were a topic for general party and public discussion on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee Theses, and then became the theme of lively debate in this hall, a political platform has been formulated. Furthermore, the conference did not simply approve the proposals put forward by the Central Committee, but in many ways enriched them with the experience of party organizations and labor collectives.

I will put it this way: it was with enormous interest and strenuous attention that all of us listened to the representatives of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, scientists and cultural figures, and specialists from various spheres of the national economy, as well as managers of enterprises and party workers who spoke from this rostrum. In essence the conference embraced the entire range of problems which face the party and the country at this time.

But if one is to single out the most important thing in the discussion, and in the decisions which we have adopted, then I would say the following: At the center of the attention of the conference was the question of the role of the party as the political vanguard. What can one note here if one is briefly summing up the opinions of the delegates? What conclusions can one draw? There is complete conviction that the party has a precise program for action, formulated by the 27th congress and enriched by the already available experience of restructuring. It has the unconditional support of the people, who have accepted the policy of restructuring and will not allow any backtracking. As far as I understand there is no doubt about that among the conference delegates. [applause]

The desire to see the party still stronger has resounded passionately and demandingly here. That can only be welcomed, and I think that all of us are pleased about it.

Our conference—and this is stated in its resolution—has demanded that our party be in full measure a Leninist-type party not just in its content but also in its methods and activities. In other words, it must irrevocably give up methods of commanding and ordering, and pursue its policies through organizational, cadre, and ideological work with the strictest observance of Soviet laws and democratic principles of public life. There must be no substitution for state bodies, no substitution for economic... State bodies [Gorbachev stumbles over choice of words] and no diktat over the trade unions, the Komsomol, and other public organizations, including the creative and other unions. Does this mean that the leading role of the party may slacken? Such doubts have been voiced.

In my opinion the conference has given a fairly clear and convincing answer to this question. No! Remaining the ruling party, the party has at its disposal all the necessary levers for carrying out its leading role. The main one of these levers is the 20 million Communists, through whom the party is pursuing its political course in all the spheres of our society's life.

In conditions of democratization and glasnost and change in the functions of party committees, the authority of the party, comrades, will undergo a grave test. This process is already under way. Let us be frank. Under the conditions of the command system of administration, when the party apparatus gave orders to all and sundry, it was hard at times to sort out where a party committee and a party secretary had the genuine authority of leader, and where, at best, they had the authority of their office and people, submitted to them only out of necessity. There is no doubt, comrades, that restructuring and reform of the political system are creating and will create a fundamentally different situation. The leading role of the party in these new conditions will be wholly determined by the real authority, which has to be proven afresh each time by specific deeds. This is why it is simply vitally necessary for us to overcome the slightest passivity on the part of party members. Every Communist must become a fighter for restructuring and the revolutionary transformation of society. Let this be the main mandate of our conference. [applause]

Altogether, comrades, the conference has been a major stage in the development of the Leninist line of the April Central Committee plenum and the 27th party conference in deepening the theory and practice of restructuring. This determines its political scale and weight. In this connection I should like to express one concept of principle. We have adopted a whole series of deeply considered, responsible decisions; but if we delay in implementing them—and this is one of the chronic complaints we are not yet rid of, and shows itself, and showed itself in the first years of restructuring—then much could go for nothing. We must speak about this again frankly. Therefore let me shake off these ancient ills, and at once get down to practical work, without waiting for any supplementary orders, circulars, instructions, or explanations.

The spirit of the conference must take fire. The forthcoming report-back and election campaign should be run on the basis of the principles on which we have begun to work. In the autumn, work must be done and alterations made in the structure of the apparatus, so that the people know that this will be put into effect. If we talk about the rebirth of the soviets, we have to solve the whole range of questions. Therefore this work must be organized within the framework of the Central Committee and the Presidium. All these problems must be worked out so that at the autumn session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, all the questions connected with reorganization can be debated. In April 1989, it will be possible to hold elections of people's deputies of the USSR, and in the autumn, for the supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics, and so on.

Taking into account the tremendous significance of these problems, the Presidium is introducing for the conference's consideration a short resolution on certain urgent measures for the implementation of democratization of Soviet society and the implementation of the reform of the political system. If the comrades are in agreement with it, its text could then be proposed at the end—there are drafts—and it could be decided upon.

As far the results of the conference are concerned, the political results of the conference, what should be our attitude to them, so that every delegate, returning with

his impressions, with great experience after this conference, should be able to relate to his comrades in work and to Communists and nonparty people, to all citizens, how we are going to proceed so that what we agreed on at the conference is embodied in life.

I would like to stress further that this matter has been thoroughly considered and has remained at the center of the conference's attention until the last moment of its proceedings. The question of the democratization and radical reform of the political system has determined its main directions and parameters. The conference has created, I think, comrades, political and ideological preconditions necessary for imparting a new impetus to the entire process of restructuring. I think that the way we have considered and resolved this issue gives a precise answer to the main question facing it, our conference; the question of ensuring guarantees, ensuring that restructuring is deepened and that there are guarantees of its irreversability. I thus think that we have all grounds to say that the conference has coped with its main task, with what it had to deal with, that is, the working out of political directives. [applause]

Large-scale and intense organizational work aimed at implementing reform is undoubtedly ahead of us. Let us not simplify things. We now have to thoroughly discuss all this, both in the party and among the whole of society. The conference will therefore live on in the atmosphere and process of continuing the discussion among society. We now know exactly how we should change our political system. We all hold this view. We have worked it out here. We have given it form in the shape of directives, which we are offering to society.

The determination to continue and deepen the radical economic reform that we have begun, which could be heard strongly at this conference, is of no less importance. I would say that although it has already begun, and we created the necessary preconditions for it, it seems, earlier, at the June Central Committee plenum, and by adopting legislative acts, especially ones like the law on the state socialist enterprise and on cooperatives, and so forth, nevertheless, the experience we gained during the first months when our enterprises, the large mass of our enterprises, were working on the principles laid down in the law on enterprises, must evidently have prompted us to this: questions regarding the progress of the reform also proved to be at the center of attention. This is correct, because everything that occurs at the basis is of enormous importance for the entire society. This is the basis, after all, the basis, the foundation of restructuring.

As for the key, crucial aspects of the discussion on these issues, and the keen criticism voiced here, it seems to me that the point is that after the conference we must embark on thoroughly completing the work on dismantling the old mechanism, the mechanism which puts a brake on radical economic reform, even at those enterprises which have already started and have transferred to the principles enshrined in the law on enterprises, to say nothing of the fact that we must bear this in mind while preparing for the transfer of the rest, which are to start this work next year. We must evidently say straight out here—all the representatives of practically all the delegations mentioned this—that bureaucracy is still fiercely baring its teeth, putting up resistance, hindering, and putting spanners in the works. And we can see our reform wheel-spinning in many aspects. This, perhaps, is one of the important observations delegates brought with them. This is therefore a widespread phenomenon. We in the Central Committee, the Government, and in all organizations, both central and local, must draw our conclusions from this. So that we can thoroughly and without delay get down to pushing ahead the process of radical economic reform more strongly.

All delegations, I think, will unanimously back the opinion of those comrades who spoke about the need, at the present stage of our development, to concentrate our main efforts upon resolving the food program, and to put forward as our prime task that of helping our peasantry in every way to rehabilitate villages and agriculture. Everything else that can be done in this 5-year period must of necessity be done.

The main thing, comrades, is that we have already sought out a great deal and directed it into this sphere through various channels in terms of capital investments and resources. All this must be assimilated and put to effect. This is quite simply our sacred duty as party and economic leaders. [applause]

I think that if after our conference we make stricter demands and constantly submit to glasnost this process of implementing the directives of the conference aimed at supporting the agrarian sector and rural workers, the policy of accelerating the transformation of the countryside in order to reach the most rapid resolution of hte food problem, then this will be the right thing to do. [applause]

It seems to me that another distinctive feature of our conference is that the most vital problems of politics and economics were discussed here not in isolation from the intellectual sphere, and they were given a moral dimension, as it were. This was a manifestation of a profound understanding of the fact that at the present stage of social development, when the scientific-technical revolution exercises a vast influence on all social processes, no problems can be properly solved without the intellectural and moral potential of the people. This was the reason for the high—I would even say heightened—tone of the discussion of the problems of science, education and culture and the fate of literature and art. I cannot recall, and I don't know whether other older people can recall, this front being represented to such an extent among speakers even at congresses. I am not aware of this occurring before. Different view points resounded

from this rostrum, reflecting the tendencies which interact or even conflict in the public consciousness. That is natural. We are affirming a pluralism of opinions, we reject intellectual monopoly.

But I think you will agree that the diverse judgements presented to the conference contain a principal, unifying thought: in everything people must be the starting point; action must proceed from the interests of the people; and the humanist values of socialism must be affirmed. If that is done, a pure moral atmosphere will be guaranteed in society, creative thought will function intensively, and there will be a genuine flowering of culture. We don't need a blind faith in a radiant future, but a scientific forecast drawing on an in-depth and precise knowledge of the inexhaustible possibilities contained in people, their work and creative activity, people of a socialist society. That is why we speak of the new, human face of socialism as the goal of restructuring. [applause]

It can be said that one of the heroines of the conference was glasnost, primarily because our very discussion was the result of the atmosphere of openness, honesty, and sincerity which is becoming firmly established in society but also because the theme of where we go from here with glasnost, what its possible and sensible limits are, was discussed here.

And although opinions were not all identical in their import, I believe that here too in the final analysis, we agreed that it is necessary in every possible way to support the mass media and their work to clear and shovel aside all sorts of negative phenomena which have been carried down to us from the past, and to stimulate bold, extraordinary and interesting people, the real heroes of restructuring. On the other hand, the demand to journalists to raise their responsibility for the printed word and to rid themselves of group and departmental ambitions and biasses and from laying claims to have a monopoly on the truth resounded just as clearly. The times are still all too fresh in the memory of the people when the printed word was the obedient instrument of authoritarianism and bureaucratic arbitrary rule. That is why it is so important to learn today, at a time when all aspects of our life are being humanized, the culture of criticism, the culture of comradely polemic.

I think, comrades, that in this respect too the work of the conference—and indeed I think that I have already talked about this—has not been in vain. We have all come to have a better understanding of how party debate must be conducted. [applause]

In my reactions to the discussions at the conference, I would not like to pass over—and evidently the delegates to the conference are counting on this—the speech by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Above all, I think that we acted correctly in offering the floor to Comrade Yeltsin here at the conference. As I have already said, it is necessary to remove the covers of secrecy—although there is no secret at all—within the framework of our democracy. I would like to say that in the part where he dealt with the concrete problems being discussed at the conference, his speech coincided to a significant degree with both the report and the debate. In this sense, his speech flowed into the general stream of the discussions. We also note, for ourselves, that Comrade Yeltsin, like others, spoke in favor of continuing restructuring and deepening it, in the interests of society and in the interests of the people.

But I cannot agree with Comrade Yeltsin's statement that we announced restructuring without adequate analysis of the causes of the stagnation which had arisen, without analysis of the comtemporary situation in society, without deep analysis of history, analysis of the errors of omission committed by the party—that the restructuring has the character of something done for effect. During the preparations for the conference and the discussion which took place in the party and in society and at the conference itself, we assessed from principled positions both the achievements and the problems of restructuring, and the activity of the party, of party and state bodies, of labor collectives, and of the country as a whole. I shall say this: We have acted correctly, comrades, for there is much that troubles us in how the process of restructuring is developing. That anxiety has been heard here; it has mobilized us; it has reinforced our view that the process of restructuring must be advanced even more resolutely.

But I believe that Comrade Yeltsin's criticism to the effect that we have not achieved any revolutionary changes in 3 years is also unjust and unacceptable. To be sure, if seen from the point of view of how we...[Gorbachev corrects himself] from the point of view of our general idea, which is calculated for an extensive period—and our strategy of restructuring is aimed at long-term prospects, at deep changes, at reaching a new quality of our society through restructuring—then we cannot talk yet of revolutionary changes. Moreover, we have devoted much to understanding the society in which we live and where it is now, to understanding the past, since the roots of many present-day events and phenomena reach back to the past. We have tackled this. We have resolved to understand the world around us, in which we live, and our interrelationship with it. And we had to do all that in order not simply to act by leading such an enormous country with its enormous weight and authority in the world, to act somehow in bursts, with revolutionary jumps and leaps: that is extremely dangerous. For this reason, we had primarily to rid ourselves of improvization in policy. We had to involve society and all our intellectual and scientific potential to get an understanding of everything; and it was against the background of that analysis, a very serious analysis, a critical analysis—and I do not think we have completed it, but we have reached such a level in it which enabled us then to propose the policy of restructuring, to transform it into practical solutions in the main areas—that we had to do, and we had to do it responsibly. The most important achievement of this stage is in that sense. In

the first place, we proposed the policy, just the same, and nobody was able to propose any other policy at that time. There is no alternative to restructuring [applause] and this is a great achievement of the party and the whole of society.

We are as much concerned about dealing with practical tasks which worry our people and our society as is Comrade Yeltsin, and I think that the speeches here, particularly those of representatives of the working class, have shown us how the people hope that we will deal more rapidly with practical issues. We've had this here, too. I don't know why Comrade Yeltsin voiced his critical attitude to the Theses, and cast doubt on how sound and how well-thought-out they are. I think that in the party, in the country, and throughout the world, this document has been received as being a very serious one. It has been analyzed by the whole country, the whole party, the whole world. And more than this, I cannot understand why it was said that members of the Central Committee did not take part in drafting the Theses. I have personally met two-thirds of the Central Committee, not to mention the fact that they wrote and spoke, and made speeches, and so forth.

Finally there was the Central Committee plenum that discussed the draft of the Central Committee Theses; Comrade Yeltsin took part then and didn't say anything of the sort. Once again it is this position of saying nothing in one place, and then finding somewhere in which to say something. I don't understand, Boris Nikolayevich. He didn't even ask for the floor. If he had comments, he'd have been, of course...[pauses] after all, a great many people spoke there. There are Central Committee members here, and they remember the situation.

I think, comrades, that the very best persuasive argument that restructuring is growing and gaining strength in the country is our conference today, the whole nature of the discussions, the documents adopted, and in my view, all the arguments are, so to speak, to hand. All the same, comrades, I do have, as it were, in purely human terms some...[pauses] I perceive above all, after all...[pauses] probably everything that happens in the Central Committee and the Politburo affects the Politburo first, but surely the general secretary most of all. And now, on the history of this issue. When we recommended Comreade Yeltsin in the capacity of first secretary of the Moscow gorkom we were proceding from the fact that the work of the Moscow party organization of the capital was in need of a serious improvement, and that the situation itself in Moscow required considerable improvement. A person was needed, both experienced and energetic, with a critical approach to all sorts of phenomena. We had observed these qualities in Comrade Yeltsin. This served as the basis for proposing him for the post of first secretary of the Moscow gorkom, and your humble servant also put his signature to this. In the first instance, Comrade Yeltsin became actively involved in the work, and did a great deal to animate and improve the work. He gave critical analyses, launched into work on many negative features in Moscow which had built up, and we supported Comrade Yeltsin in his efforts and understood that there was a difficult task facing the Moscow party organization.

Without describing in detail all Comrade Yeltsin's activities I will say that at a certain stage we could sense that something not quite right was going on. When did it start? It started when the stage for practical solutions to the problems of restructuring arrived, for its transformation to all spheres of life—the stage of constructive work, the stage for fulfilling promises. At this point, the situation in the Moscow party organization suddenly became more complicated. Intense in-depth work was needed, aimed at fundamental changes, but neither the city committee as a whole nor its first secretary was up to this. Instead of relying on the party organization, the cadres and collectives, Comrade Yeltsin began in his practical work to go astray, with shouting and command methods, and this was followed by a ceaseless change of cadres. At first we believed this was justified, that the wrong people had been appointed, that the conference—the conference held in the city—had not been able to deal correctly with the cadre issue, that no doubt this was the case, that there were people who generally couldn't deal with the new tasks and assume the leadership of the party organization at this turning point in the development of the city and, indeed, of the country.

When he went through a second and third round of cadre changes we could see that it was taking on a character that quite simply disturbed us. An observation was made in the Politburo of Comrade Yeltsin by me personally. This was received with some emotion, but things were said in a comradely manner and, morevoer, it was said that from this Boris Nikolayevich should draw one conclusion: to take it into account, nothing more, nothing less. It was help, nothing else.

This, I think, was the tragedy [drama] of Comrade Yeltsin as a political worker: At a crucial stage, when practical deeds had to be tackled, he did not have the strength and went astray with big phrases, with statements which were not backed up by work, and with administration by injunction. But even at that point, comrades—everything must be revealed, comrades, and we have to take this issue all the way, so to speak—the Politburo did not consider Comrade Yeltsin as lost and incapable of working. We continued to give him support. Major decisions on Moscow were adopted, about which I have already spoken at the Moscow gorkom plenum. I just don't want to repeat myself now. When I was on vacation in August 1987 I received a private letter from Comrade Yeltsin—in August—which raised the question of releasing him from the duties of first secretary of the party gorkom. I considered it essential not to rush, and to look into it closely. I didn't show the letter to anyone. Even the Politburo did not know of the existence of that letter. I decided to talk to Comrade Yeltsin after my vacation, to have a chat. We talked, and

decided to hold the anniversary celebrations and then meet and discuss everything. He agreed with that approach, but contrary to our understanding, Comrade Yeltsin spoke at the October Central Committee plenum. I have spoken already about the content of that speech, and it was published—that speech of mine at the Moscow gorkom. There was nothing beyond that in what I said. But it really was a big issue at stake, and then at the plenum, after the discussion and observations by the comrades, Comrade Yeltsin acknowledged his mistakes. I will quote the shorthand report; I just asked for the shorthand report of that plenum during the interval. Here is the end of that report, after everyone had spoken—27 people, or however many it was, I don't remember now: Gorbachev: Tell us what you think of the observations by your Central Committee, comrades. They have said a great deal about you and ought to know what you think. They are, after all, going to make a decision. Yeltsin, Boris Nikolayevich: Apart from certain expressions, I agree on the whole with the assessment. That fact that I let down the Central Committee and the Moscow city organization was a mistake. Gorbachev: Will you have the strength to carry on? [The following sentence addressed to the conference] The Central Committee members know that I [pauses]... that this is how it all happened. Voices: He will not be able to. He must not be left in such a post. Gorbachev: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. I'm putting the question to him. Let's approach things in a democratic way. The answer is needed by all of us before making a decision. Yeltsin, Boris Nikolayevich: I have said that I let down the party Central Committee, the Politburo, and the Moscow party organization, and judging by the fairly unanimous assessments by the Central Committee members and Politburo members, I repeat what I have said: I ask to be released both as a candidate member of the Politburo, and accordingly, as leader of the Moscow city party organization as well. [end of quote from report]

Nonetheless, after that I asked the Central Committee members to accept the second part, besides their attitudes toward his speech, and to give an assessment of it. It was (?deemed) to be politically erroneous and he himself admitted this. Nonetheless, I asked the Central Committee members not to decide at that time the question of releasing Comrade Yeltsin from his duties as candidate, and so forth. Instruct the Politburo to examine it; it was still at issue, so to speak. But nonetheless the situation had already aroused such a reaction. It had become known here in the city—it doesn't take long; after all, (?people talked after the plenum), and the news spread. It was impossible to leave things in such a situation. We came to the plenum, and, it has to be said, the plenum said even more than [pauses]... it went into things in detail, since they had observed things. It was very acute. You know about that plenum.

In general, comrades, this is what I think. This is a lesson not just for Comrade Yeltsin, it is a lesson for the Politburo, for the general secretary, for the party Central Committee, for all of us. We must proceed firmly along the path of resolutely restoring our party to health, of its renaissance on Leninist principles, on the basis of broad democratization, relying on the primary party organizations, on the cadres, on the elected aktiv. We cannot take the road of tackling such great tasks as we have posed for our restructuring by resorting to the methods, the old ones condemned now not just by the party but by all society and by time. [applause] That's what we should draw lessons from, so to speak. [applause]

And another lesson: the comrades have rightly remarked at the conference that information should have been given and everything should have been said, and then this process, so to say, would not have developed in the form that it took. [applause]

Returning once again, comrades, to the issue of what is of concern to the delegates at the moment—I sense this from the written notes and from the statements following the notes which have been passing all the time, I have read virtually all of them—everyone is very concerned about how to ensure the implementation of the decisions we have adopted. So let us take the path of... [Gorbachev changes thought] We are today coming to agreement that as far as the party is concerned, the next report-back and election campaign and all of life are to be arranged in accordance with the conference resolutions, without waiting until the congress carries out its function and includes all this in the rules. We have the political directives of the conference, so let us be guided by them. That is the first thing.

The second thing: let us not postpone the reform of the political system as a whole, because we have already realized a lot, tried out a lot, so we know a lot, and furthermore the discussion on the eve of the session, toward autumn, will probably help us to make everything clear. But we must keep going in order to advance the process of restructuring. Today it is already encountering snags because of our existing political system which needs fundamental reform. So, may it not end up the same way—and this too is a lesson from the past—as the Central Committee January plenum.

We held a major plenum, a very major plenum, an important one, a turning point. We made a principled analysis. We exposed the reasons for what was happening in the country and in the party, why it was happening like that, but we did not think through the mechanisms, and the ideas of this plenum, as it were, were left hanging. You probably all noticed this, because we reckoned that after January, things would get going strongly, but it did not have the effect that we counted on.

That is why under no circumstances must we be allowed to condemn our party conference to such a fate. This would be unpardonable for today's party cadres and conference delegates. That is why I invite you to adopt these resolutions.

Regarding the many questions which were raised either in writing or in speeches here, comrades, they are not incorporated in the resolutions, because our resolutions dealt with specific topics. There are many practical questions, particularly concerning socioeconomic problems and others. It seems to me that we should draw general conclusions from all this and submit them for discussion by a plenum, so that a plenum can consider this and assess it all carefully, and give appropriate instructions to those concerned and verify implementation. That is how we should proceed.

Regarding the need to draw up the minutes and issue a report as quickly as possible, I think this idea was expressed in a large number of memorandums. I have already referred to this matter. We must do this without fail so that our party and all society can have at their command the thoughts, statements, advice and debate that took place at our conference here.

Now, comrades, another question that was raised at the conference. It was raised on the eve of the conference too. It is the question of erecting a monument to the victims of repressions. As you may recall, this question was already raised at the 22nd party congress in the concluding speech, and it was greeted with approval. Then it was raised at the 27th party congress, but nothing practical followed from it. As has already been said in the report, it is our political and moral duty to restore justice to the victims of lawlessness. Let us embody our agreement on this by erecting a monument in Moscow. This will be the honest and politically fitting thing to do, and I am sure that this step will meet with the support of all the Soviet people. [applause]

In concluding my speech, I return to the question asked at our conference, that is, how to deepen and make irreversible revolutionary restructuring, which at the initiative of the party and under its guidance has been launched in our country. The whole course of the work of the conference and its materials, discussions, and final documents speak convincingly of the fact that to this question the conference gives the following answer. Through democratization, economic reform, and transformation of the political system we will make restructuring irreversible. Through revolutionary restructuring we will arrive at a qualitatively new condition of our society and a new, humane, and democratic face for socialism. We will continue to advance and conduct a creative quest for ways and methods to achieve this goal in conditions of democracy and glasnost, and—what is most important—we will work tenaciously and creatively at the practical realization of the goals of revolutionary restructuring.

I wish you great success, dear comrades, and I thank you for the contribution that you have made to this. [applause]

I promised to offer you the resolution. Now I have to find it. [laughter] It could be called thus—and generally this is, so to speak, a document that was formulated quickly and therefore it may be subject to criticism, but the essence has been laid down in it, I believe:

On certain urgent measures to implement on a practical basis the reform of the country's political system: a resolution of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

The 19th all-union party conference broadly discussed and adopted major decisions on deepening restructuring, the reform of the political system, and the further democratization of party and society. They are of huge historic significance for the fate of the country, being an inalienable integral part of restructuring, and at the same time its powerful accelerator. They open up the opportunity for society to proceed confidently along the path of revolutionary renewal and to strengthen the role of the party as the political vanguard.

The implementation of the adopted decisions is urgent, and it is important, proceeding from the interests of the cause, to get down to implementing them immediately. The conference deems it necessary, in the first place, to carry out this year a report-back and election campaign in party organizations, being guided by the decisions of the conference on the reform of the political system, and the democratization of party life; to carry out by the end of this year the reorganization of the party apparatus; to introduce the necessary changes in its structure, taking into account the decisions adopted on the division of functions between the party and the soviets; and to recommend to the CPSU Central Committee that the necessary practical work for these purposes be carried out.

Second, the conference advocates the submission for examination at a routine session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the drafts of legislative acts for the restructuring of local soviet bodies and the necessary additions and changes to the USSR Constitution, and the organization of elections and the holding of the congress of people's deputies in April 1989, at which new bodies of state power are to be formed; and that elections to republican local soviets and the formation on this basis of leading local soviet bodies in republics, krays, oblasts, cities, rayons, settlements, and rural areas be conducted in autumn 1989.

This is what I said. What do you think? [applause] I think it is simply vitally necessary to adopt the resolutions. Is that right, comrades? [audience agrees] Are there any objections to the text? [audience says: "no"] Allow me to put it to the vote. I ask those in favor of adopting this resolution to raise their cards. Please put them down. [video: delegates raise red cards] Are there any against? Any abstentions? No, the resolution is adopted unanimously. [applause]

Dear comrades, we are coming to the end. It is now time to close our conference. Does anyone want to take the floor to express any remarks? [murmurs of "no"] You have talked yourselves out! [laughter] Good. In that case, may I declare the 19th all-union party conference closed. [applause]

PRAVDA Publishes Speech

PM0207175988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Speech by M.S. Gorbachev at the closing of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 1 July]

[Text] Comrades! Our conference is ending its work. The documents that have just been adopted on the results of the debate and the discussion itself of the documents releave me of the necessity to draw lengthy conclusions. Nevertheless, the conference has been an event of such scale that there is a need to assess the work we have done over the past 4 days in accordance with the most rigorous criteria.

This is necessary not in order to pay tribute to past traditions of praising each routine party forum. It is necessary, I believe, so that we ourselves recognize the 19th party conference's place in the life of the party and the country. A major event has occurred in our party's history. (Applause).

First of all, the atmosphere of the debate. It was a real, open, party discussion of the main current preoccupation of Communists and all Soviet people, an attempt to find answers to questions that worry them. The Palace of Congresses has never seen a discussion like it, comrades, and I believe we would not be telling a lie if we said that there has been nothing like it in nearly six decades. (Applause)... In this sense we are entitled to say that the conference took place in a Leninist spirit, and lofty responsibility to the people and to the revolution triumphed at it. (Applause). And this on its own gives it a special meaning.

One couldn't help noticing the delegates' extremely high activeness. It must be said that we were in a difficult situation. In fact, there were around 300 people who had put their names down to speak. Unfortunately, not all of them were able to speak, but to some extent the need to speak found an outlet at the sessions of the drafting commissions—as I said before, around 150 people spoke there. It is a new form of work for us, in which nearly one-tenth of the conference delegates participated, and it made for a businesslike consideration of many concrete issues that emerged during the debate and for solutions to be found.

The conference was dominated by a spirit of high exactingness, a robust and principled statement of the issues, and, at the same time, party comradeship, one might even say, amicability toward one another. And this is also an example to the whole party and the whole of our society, that is what it should be like between people of like mind, people who are engaged in the great cause of restructuring and renewal of society and feel that they have behind them hundreds, thousands, and millions of their comrades in the party and all Soviet people, who have been following our work with immense interest. In this sense the conference—I think this can be said—reflected the political atmosphere that is being established in our country and it demonstrated the level of democratic development attained by the party, and not only by the party, but by the whole of Soviet society in the period of just over 3 years since the Central Committee April plenum.

Now for the content of our work. Its chief result is that a programmatic political position was elaborated on all the fundamental questions which were the subject of partywide and nationwide discussion on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee Theses and were then the theme of a lively debate in this hall. And the conference did not simply approve the proposals made by the Central Committee, but in many respects enriched them with the experience of party organizations and labor collectives. I will say this: We all listened with enormous interest and rapt attention to the representives of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, the scientists and cultural figures, the specialists in various spheres of the national economy, the enterprise leaders, and party workers who spoke here.

Essentially, the conference covered the whole range of problems facing the party and the country at the present stage. But if I were to single out the most important elements in the debate and in the decisions we have adopted, I would say the following. The conference focused attention on the question of the party's role as the political vanguard. What can one say by way of a brief summary of the delegates' opinions? There is a total conviction that the party has a clear-cut action program, elaborated by the 27th congress and enriched by the experience of restructuring so far. It has the unconditional support of the people who have accepted the restructuring policy and will not allow any backtracking. As I understand it, the conference delegates had no doubts about this. (Applause).

There was expressed here in a passionate and exacting manner a desire to see an even stronger party, and this can only be welcomed and I believe we are all pleased about that. The conference, as its resolution states, demanded that our party should be in full measure a party of the Leninist type, not only in content, but in its methods of activity as well. In other words, it must abandon once and for all the command and injunction methods and conduct its policy through organizational, cadre, and ideological work while most rigorously observing Soviet laws and democratic principles of social life.

There must be no supplanting of state bodies and no diktat over trade unions, the Komsomol, and other public organizations and creative and other unions.

Does this mean that the party's leading role could wane? Such doubts were expressed. In my view, the conference gave a quite clear and convincing answer to this question: No. Remaining the ruling party, the party possesses all the requisite levers for implementing its leading role. And the chief one is the 20 million Communists through whom the party conducts its political course in all spheres of the life of society.

In conditions of democratization, glasnost, and the changing of the functions of party committees, the party's authority will undergo a serious test. This process is already taking place. Let us be frank: In the conditions of the command and administer system, when the party apparatus gave orders to all and sundry, it was sometimes difficult to work out where a party committee and party secretary had leading authority and where, at best, they had "authority of office" and people submitted to them only out of necessity.

There is no doubt, comrades, that restructuring and the reform of the political system are creating a fundamentally different situation. The party's leading role in the new conditions will be entirely determined by the real authority which has to be demonstrated anew each time by concrete actions. That is why it is simply vital for us to overcome the slightest passivity in members of the party. Every Communist must be a fighter for restructuring and for the revolutionary renewal of society. Let this be the principal mandate of our conference. (Applause).

By and large, comrades, the conference has been a major stage in developing the Leninist line of the Central Committee April plenum and 27th party congress and in deepening the theory and practice of restructuring. This determines its political scale and weight.

In this connection, I want to express one fundamental notion. We have adopted a number of meticulously thought-out and responsible decisions. But if we delay their implementation—and this is one of the chronic diseases we have not yet shaken off, one that has also been evident in the first years of restructuring—much of it may come to nothing. About this we must speak directly. Let us shake off the chronic ills and embark immediately on practical work, without waiting for any extra decrees, circulars, instructions, and elucidations.

The necessary work must be organized within the framework of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. We must get to the point where the upcoming report and election campaign takes place on the basis of the principles we have agreed on here. Changes are to be made to the apparatus structure in the fall. As for reorganization of the soviets, the whole range of questions connected with this will be examined at the fall session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Elections of USSR people's deputies could be held in April 1989 and elections to union and autonomous republics' Supreme Soviets could be held in the fall of next year.

In view of the enormous significance of these problems, the conference presidium is submitting for the delegates' consideration a brief resolution on some urgent measures on the practical implementation of the reform of the country's political system.

As far as the political results of the conference are concerned, every delegate, when he gets home, will be able to tell his work comrades, Communists and nonparty people, and all citizens how we are going to act in the future and put its decisions into practice.

Furthermore, up until the last moment of the conference's work, our attention was focused on the question of the democratization of society and radical reform of the political system. By determining its main directions and parameters, I believe we have answered the main question facing us: How to ensure the deepening of restructuring and guarantee its irreversibility. Thus, there is every reason to say that the conference has done its main job. (Applause).

Of course, some hard organizational work has still to be done to implement the reform. We have to thoroughly discuss all this in the party and in society. But we now know precisely how the political system should be transformed, we have elaborated a common opinion, and given it the form of political precepts.

The resolve to continue and deepen the radical economic reform, forcefully expressed at the conference, is equally significant. The prerequisites for it were established by the decisions of the Central Committee June (1987) plenum and by the adoption of legislative acts, in particular the laws on the state enterprise (association) and on the cooperative system. Our attention was focused on experience acquired in the first months of work by a large mass of enterprises in accordance with the new principles and questions connected with the progress of the reform. And this is right: Everything that is happening at the bottom is of immense significance for society; it is the foundation of restructuring.

As for the key, crucial aspects of the debate on these questions, the main point made was that after the conference, we must get down in earnest to finishing work on dismantling the inhibiting machinery. Representatives of practically all the delegations said that bureaucratism is still baring its teeth, so to speak, resisting, and putting a spoke in the wheels. As a result, the reform is getting bogged down in many areas. This is perhaps one of the most important observations the delegates brought with them and it means that it is a widespread phenomenon. So we in the Central Committee and in the Government and central and local organizations must make every effort to more vigorously promote the process of radical economic reform.

I believe the delegates will unanimously support the view of the comrades who talked about the need to concentrate primarily at the present stage on solving the food

problem and advancing the paramount task of giving our peasantry all-round assistance and boosting agriculture. What can still be done in the current 5-year plan must be done without fail. We have already sought out extra capital investments and resources and directed them into this sphere through various channels. All this must be properly assimilated and utilized. It is simply our sacred duty to boost agriculture. I think that after the conference, tougher demands will have to be made and the whole process of implementing its guidelines on support for the agrarian sector and rural working people will have to be monitored. Then we will be able to ensure the speediest solution of the food problem. (Applause).

Another feature of the conference, it seems to me, was the fact that the most vital political and economic problems were discussed in close connection with the spiritual sphere and were given a kind of moral dimension. This was evidence of a deep understanding of the fact that at the present stage of social development and in conditions of the scientific-technical revolution's enormous influence on all social processes, no problems can be really solved without the intellectual and moral potential of the people. Hence the high, I would even say, heightened tone of the discussion of problems of science, education, culture, and the future of literature and art.

I do not remember and I do not know of any other party forums, even congresses, at which this sector has been so widely represented. Various views were expressed at the conference, reflecting trends that are interacting and sometimes conflicting in the social consciousness. This is logical. We are asserting a pluralism of opinions and are rejecting the spiritual monopoly. But I think you will agree that among the diverse judgments offered at the conference, the chief unifying idea is as follows: It is necessary in all things to start with people, act on the basis of the people's interests, and establish the humanitarian values of socialism. Then a pure moral atmosphere in society will be guaranteed, along with intensive creative thinking and genuine cultural prosperity.

What we need is not blind faith in a bright future, but scientific forecasts based on profound and exact knowledge of the inexhaustible potential of the people of a socialist society, of their labor and creativity. That is why we talk about the new, human face of socialism as the goal of restructuring. (Applause).

It can be said that glasnost was one of the conference heroines. Primarily because our very debate was the result of the establishment of an atmosphere of openness, honesty, and sincerity in society. But also because we discussed here what we are going to do with glasnost in the future, what its potential and reasonable limits are. And although opinions varied, I believe that here too we ultimately concurred that it is necessary to give every backing to the mass media and their work on clearing out and sweeping away all manner of negative phenomena inherited from the past and stimulating bold, original, interesting people, real heroes of restructuring.

On the other hand, there was an equally clear demand for journalists to be more responsible about what they write and to rid themselves of cliquish and departmental ambitions and biases and stop laying claim to a monopoly on the truth. The times when the printed word was the obedient instrument of authoritarianism and bureaucratic tyranny are still fresh in people's memories. That is why it is so important to learn today, at a time of humanization of all aspects of our life, the skills of criticism, the skills of comradely polemics. I believe, and in this respect the conference work was not in vain, that we all have a better understanding of how to conduct a party debate. (Applause).

In my reaction to the discussion I do not think it possible to pass over the speech made by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Above all, I think that we acted correctly in offering him the floor. As I have already said, democracy necessitates the removal of the shrouds of secrecy from such questions, although there is, incidentally, no secret here.

That part of Comrade Yeltsin's speech where he deals with the specific problems discussed at the conference coincides to a considerable degree with the report and the debates. In that sense his proposals form part of the general current of discussion. We also note that Comrade Yeltsin, like others, spoke in favor of continuing restructuring and deepening it in the interests of society and the people.

But I cannot agree with B.N. Yeltsin's statement that we announced restructuring without adequate analysis of the causes of the stagnation which had arisen, without analysis of the contemporary situation of society, without deep analysis of history and the omissions committed by the party, or that restructuring has the character of something done for effect.

During preparation for the conference and the discussion which took place in the party and society and at the conference itself, we have from positions of principle assessed both the achievements and the problems of restructuring and summed up the activity of party and state organs, labor collectives, and the country as a whole. I will say this: We have acted correctly, comrades, for all of us are concerned about how restructuring is developing. That anxiety has been voiced here, it has galvanized us, strengthened our intention to advance the process of reforms even more resolutely.

I think that Comrade Yeltsin's criticism that we have achieved no revolutionary transformations in 3 years is also unjust and unacceptable. Of course, if you have the overall, long-term scheme of things in mind, our society's attainment of a new quality through restructuring, then it is impossible as yet to talk about revolutionary transformations. We have spent quite a lot of time in getting to understand the society in which we live, the past, where the roots of many of our present-day phenomena lie, the surrounding world, and our relationship

with it. All this had to be understood in order to prevent operating by "revolutionary leaps," which are extremely dangerous, and in order not to permit improvization in policy. We had to involve society and its intellectual and scientific potential to get to the bottom of all this and develop a policy of restructuring based on serious critical analysis and then transform it into practical decisions in the main areas. This had to be done. And it had to be done responsibl . We thus proposed the policy of restructuring, and there is no alternative to it. (Applause). This in itself was a great achievement for the party in the past stage.

We are as much concerned as is Comrade Yeltsin with the practical tasks that worry our people. And I think that the speeches heard here, particularly those of representatives of the working class, have shown that working people hope for the most rapid solution of these questions.

I do not know either why Comrade Yeltsin voiced a critical attitude to the Central Committee Theses and questioned how thorough and well-considered they are. This document has been received as a very serious one in the party, the country, and the world. Nor do I understand his claim that Central Committee members did not take part in the preparation of the Theses. I have met personally with two-thirds of the members of the Central Committee, not to mention the fact that they have written and made their own comments. And finally there was the plenum at which the draft Theses were discussed. Comrade Yeltsin took part in its work, but said nothing, did not ask to speak. Central Committee members are present here and will remember how it was.

I think, comrades, that our present conference and the whole character of the discussion and the documents passed are the most convincing evidence that restructuring is underway in the country and is gathering momentum.

In trying to understand in human terms everything that is happening in the Central Committtee and the Politburo—it, after all, concerns the general secretary first and foremost—I am bound to return to the history of the question. When we recommended Comrade Yeltsin as first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom, we did so on the basis that the work in the capital's party organization needed serious enhancement and that the situation in Moscow itself required improvement. An experienced, energetic person with a critical approach was needed. We observed those qualities in Comrade Yelstin, which served as the basis for his nomination to that post. And your humble servant also appended his signature. In the initial period Yeltsin energetically involved himself in the work, did much to revive it, and launched a struggle against the negative phenomena that had accumulated in Moscow. We supported him in his efforts, appreciating that the Moscow party organization faced difficult tasks, but at a certain stage we sensed that something was amiss. This began when the time for a practical solution of the problems of restructuring came, its transformation into all spheres of life, when strenuous and intensive work designed to effect radical changes was needed. Neither the gorkom as a whole nor the first secretary was up to this. And Comrade Yeltsin, instead of relying on the party organization, people, and collectives, began resorting to hectoring and command methods. This was followed by a ceaseless change of cadres.

We initially thought that this was probably justified, that the wrong comrades had been chosen, and that the conference held in the city had been unable to correctly resolve the cadre issue. And that probably was the case. Not everyone proved capable of solving the new tasks and assuming leadership of a party organization at that crucial stage in the development of the city and the country. But when he started changing cadres for the second and third time round, it began to worry us. I made a comment to Comrade Yeltsin at the Politburo. I said, in a comradely manner, that Boris Nikolayevich must draw his own conclusion and incorporate it in his work. In other words, it was help, nothing more.

What do I think is the tragedy [drama] of Comrade Yeltsin as a politician?: At the stage when practical things had to be solved, he lacked the strength and resorted to big talk, statements, and overadministration. But even then—everyone has to know about this, we must clear up this question completely—the Politburo did not consider Comrade Yeltsin as lost and incapable of working further. We continued to support him, and major decisions were taken on Moscow, about which I spoke at the Moscow party gorkom plenum.

In August 1987, when I was on vacation, I received a personal letter from Comrade Yeltsin in which he raised the question of his being released from his post as first secretary of the party gorkom. I deemed it essential not to rush but to look into it carefully, and even the Politburo did not know of the letter's existence. I decided to have a chat with Boris Nikolayevich after my vacation and proposed to him that we get the events marking the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution out of the way and then meet and talk things over. He agreed but, contrary to our understanding, unexpectedly spoke at the Central Committee October plenum. I have already spoken about the thrust of his speech, and my speech at the Moscow gorkom plenum has been published. I said nothing else at the time. Comrade Yeltsin, after discussion and comments by comrades, acknowledged his mistakes.

I will quote from the verbatim record of the plenum—an episode at the end of the session, after everyone had spoken:

"Gorbachev: Tell us how you regard the comments of your Central Committee comrades. They have said a lot about you and ought to know what you think. They will, after all, be taking a decision.

"Yeltsin: Aside from certain expressions, I agree with the assessment on the whole. The fact that I let the Central Committee and the Moscow city organization down by speaking today—that was a mistake.

"Gorbachev: Will you have the strength to carry on your work?

"Voices. He will not be able to. He must not be allowed to remain in such a post.

"Gorbachev: Wait a minute, wait a minute, it is me who is asking him the question. Let us approach the matter in a democratic way. We all need an answer before taking a decision.

"Yeltsin: I have said that I let down the party Central Committee, the Politburo, the Moscow party organization.... I repeat what I said: 'I ask to be released both as candidate member of the Politburo and leader of the Moscow city party organization.'"

Those are the facts. After Comrade Yeltsin's speech was acknowledged to be politically mistaken—he himself acknowledged this—I nevertheless put it to the Central Committee members as follows: Do not decide the question of his release from his duties as candidate member of the Politburo now, let us instruct the Politburo to examine the question. But the situation had already caused such a reaction that the matter could not be left as it was. We spoke about everything at the Moscow gorkom plenum, and the comrades there said what they thought about Comrade Yelstin's work far more trenchantly—you know about this.

In general, comrades, I think that this serves as a lesson not only for Comrade Yeltsin but for the Politburo, the general secretary of the Central Committee, and us all. We must firmly pursue the path of resolutely reviving our party in line with Leninist principles, on the basis of broad democratization, relying on the primary party organizations, cadres, and the elective aktiv. We cannot solve the great tasks of restructuring we have set ourselves by resorting to the old methods, which have been condemned not only by the party and the whole of society but by time itself. (Applause).

And one more lesson. Comrades have rightly remarked at the conference that information should have been given and everything said, the process would not then have developed the way it did. (Applause).

I return once again, comrades, to the question of what most concerns delegates now—I sense this both from the speeches and the notes passed—the question of how to ensure the implementation of the decisions taken by us. Let us construct the whole life of the party in accordance with the conference resolutions without waiting until the congress introduces all this into the Statutes. The conference's political precepts are in being, let us be guided by them. That is the first thing.

And second. Let us not put off the reform of the political system as a whole, it is essential so that the restructuring process make progress. The process is being held up right now by the existing political system. No repetition of what happened with the Central Committee January plenum must be allowed. It was a major plenum which carried out an in-depth analysis and revealed the causes of what had occurred in the party and the country. But we did not think through the mechanisms for implementing the plenum decisions, and they were left suspended in mid air, as it were, things did not go as we planned. In no circumstances must the decisions of our party conference be condemned to the same fate.

Many questions raised here are not covered by the resolutions. I think that all this should be expressed in generalized form and submitted for discussion by a plenum, specific assignments given, and their execution monitored. Many of the notes passed have suggested that a verbatim record be issued. We must do this without fail so as to arm our party and the whole of society with the ideas expressed during discussion at the conference.

And another question, comrades, that was raised on the eve of the conference and at the conference proper—the question of erecting a monument to the victims of the repressions. No doubt you will remember that it was mentioned in the closing speech at the 22d party congress and was greeted with approval. The question was also raised at the 27th party congress, but no pratical decision was made. As was said in the report, it is our political and moral duty to restore justice to the victims of lawlessness. Let us discharge this duty by erecting the monument in Moscow. I am sure this step will be supported by the entire Soviet people. (Applause).

In concluding my speech, I will return once again to a question posed before the conference: how to deepen and make irreversible the revolutionary restructuring that was launched in the country on the initiative and under the leadership of the party. The entire course of our work, the materials of the debate, and its final documents convincingly show that the conference has given a clear answer to this question: through democratization, economic reform, and transformation of the political system, we will make restructuring irreversible; through revolutionary restructuring, we will arrive at a qualitatively new state of society, a new, human and democratic face for socialism. We will proceed further and conduct a creative quest for ways and methods of attaining this goal in conditions of democracy and glasnost and will work hard on the practical implementation of the tasks facing us. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev read out the text of the resolution that was adopted unanimously. He wished the delegates fine achievements and success in their work.

Party Conference Resolutions Adopted

LD0107184688 Moscow TASS in English 1842 GMT · 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—A TASS correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU has just adopted a "package" of six resolutions which constitute a comprehensive programme for further democratisation of Soviet society.

The discussion of the resolutions—they concerned both general political problems and specific issues: glasnost, inter-ethnic relations, and combating bureaucratism—proved unusually stormy and prolonged.

After Mikhail Gorbachev as the chairman of the commission for drafting the texts of two main political resolutions of the conference described the commission's work and read out amendments which had been introduced during the commission's work, the delegates began to take the floor one after another and to introduce additional alterations.

Mikhail Gorbachev as the chairman of the commission upheld individual wordings but speakers argued with him and demanded this or that suggestion to be put to vote.

When matters came to the counting of votes, some were displeased: What is this for? Would not it be better to end the process as quickly as possible?

"No, it would not. Otherwise, how shall we learn democracy?" the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee remarked. "Democracy envisages both tolerance and patience".

A delegate to the conference, Academician Roald Sagdeyev suggested somewhat changing the wording concerning the election of chairmen of soviets of people's deputies. Mikhail Gorbachev put the suggestion to the vote. The result of the counting of votes was as follows: Slightly more than two hundred votes out of almost five thousand were in favour of the suggestion.

During the discussion of a resolution on glasnost, it was proposed that PRAVDA be made the newspaper of the entire party, and not that of the CPSU Central Committee, and be taken out of the Central Committee's control. However, only 56 delegates voted for the suggestion.

The drafts of all the resolutions were discussed in a similar way today. Alterations were introduced, the positions were compared again, and the opinion of majority was ascertained.

One can say with confidence: No party forums, and not only party ones, have been held in the USSR for decades in such a democratic manner, in such a businesslike, free and frank comradely atmosphere.

Delegates Vote; Proceedings Close

PM0207141188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 12

[Untitled TASS report on final proceedings at 1 July closing session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] The chairman [in an information report on its front page PRAVDA 2 July identifies Gorbachev as chairman of the evening session of the conference] read out a note handed in to the presidium: "The Sverdlovsk Oblast party organization delegation totally supports the decision of the CPSU Central Committee October (1987) Plenum regarding Comrade Yeltsin. No one empowered Comrade Volkov to speak in the name of the delegates. His speech has been totally condemned. On behalf of the delegation—[Signed] party Obkom First Secretary Bobykin."

Then the discussion of the draft conference resolutions began.

M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the commission to draft two resolutions, presented the draft resolution "On Progress in Implementing the 27th CPSU Congress Decisions and Tasks in Deepening Restructuring." He reported that 165 people spoke in the thorough discussion in the commission, expressing their own views, delegations' proposals, and also voters' instructions. A lively discussion of the draft resolution took place at the conference plenary session. After this the delegates unanimously adopted the resolution and its amendments and additions.

The draft resolution "On the Democratization of Soviet Society and the Reform of the Political System" was examined in equal detail after the submission of the commission chairman.

During the broad debate at the conference some delegates submitted a proposal that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary be elected not at a Central Committee plenum but at the party congress. This proposal received the support of 145 delegates. But 4,841 delegates voted in favor of the existing election procedure.

A vote was also taken on the proposal to supplement the rule that all party committee bureau members and secretaries, including members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, can be elected to the same post for two terms in succession with the following condition: "taking account of their previous service in the post." The proposal received the support of 209 delegates, 4,773 voted against, and 4 delegates abstained.

The resolution, taking into account the amendments and proposals, was adopted by the conference with two abstentions.

In thoroughly discussing the draft resolution "On the Struggle Against Bureaucratism," Ye.K. Ligachev, chairman of the commission to draft this resolution, reported, the 27 delegates who spoke in the debate submitted over 100 proposals and amendments. The conference unanimously adopted the resolution, taking into account the proposals that had been voiced.

In the commission to prepare the draft resolution "On Interethnic Relations," which was headed by N.I. Ryzhkov, 37 delegates submitted their amendments and remarks. After additional discussion at the conference plenary session, the resolution was adopted unanimously.

A.N. Yakovlev, chairman of the commission to prepare the draft resolution "On Glasnost," reported that in the course of the discussion practically all members of the commission spoke, making a painstaking and thorough analysis of all the points submitted in the draft.

During the discussion of the draft resolution "On Glasnost" at the conference, a proposal for transforming the CPSU Central Committee organ PRAVDA into a CPSU organ and electing the newspaper editorial collegium at party congresses was submitted. Fifty-three delegates voted for this proposal, and 4,933 voted against it.

The resolution "On Glasnost" as a whole was adopted unanimously.

Commission Chairman A.A. Gromyko told the delegates about the results of the discussion of the draft resolution "On Legal Reform." As a result of painstaking examination of the resolution's provisions the members of the commission made a number of amendments and proposals. Taking these into account, the resolution was adopted unanimously by the conference delegates.

The resolutions will be published.

Comrade M.S. Gorbachev delivered the closing speech at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. It was listened to with great attention and was repeatedly interrupted by applause. The speech was relayed on Soviet television and radio.

On the instructions of the presidium, M.S. Gorbachev submitted the draft resolution of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference "On Certain Urgent Measures for the Practical Implementation of the Reform of the Country's Political System."

The resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates.

The conference was declared closed.

The delegates sang the party anthem, the "Internationale."

Political Reform Resolution

PM0407231588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 88 Second Edition p 2

[Resolution of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "On the Democratization of Soviet Society and the Reform of the Political System"]

[Text] 1. The experience of 3 years of restructuring, revolutionary renewal of society, and democratization of party and public life have placed the need for in-depth reform of the political system on the agenda.

The Soviet state was born as the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat and, at a certain stage of social development, turned into a state of all the people. The task now is to ensure that Soviet statehood fully matches that concept and that all affairs in the country are decided by the people and their plenipotentiary representatives and are under the people's full and effective control.

The upcoming reform of the political system must, in the conference's opinion, resolve the following tasks:

—provide the maximum scope for the self-management of society, create conditions for the full development of the initiative of citizens, representative organs of power, party and public organizations, and labor collectives;

—establish a mechanism for the democratic identification and molding of the interests and will of all classes and social groups and their coordination and implementation in the Soviet state's domestic and foreign policy;

—ensure conditions for the further free development of every nation and ethnic group and the consolidation of their friendship and equitable cooperation based on the principles of internationalism.

—radically strengthen socialist legality and law and order in order to preclude the possibility of usurpation of power and abuses, effectively counter bureaucracy and formalism, ensure reliable safeguards for the protection of citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms and the discharge by them of their duties with regard to society and the state;

—clearly demarcate the functions of party and state organs in accordance with the Leninist conception of the role of the Communist Party as the political vanguard of society and the role of the Soviet state as the organization and instrument of power of the people;

—create an effective mechanism which will ensure the prompt self-renewal of the political system in light of changing domestic and international conditions and the development and introduction of the principles of socialist democracy and self-management in all spheres of life.

The reform of the political system must be comprehensive in nature, embrace every link of it, and be carried out in a coordinated way in conjunction with restructuring in the economy and throughout society, and, moreover, in the shortest possible time.

2. Ensuring the full power of the soviets as the bases of socialist statehood and self-management in our country is the crucial thrust of the reform of the political system.

The conference deems it essential to strengthen the legislative, administrative, and monitoring functions of soviets, to pass all important questions of state, economic, and sociocultural life to them for their examination and decision, and to restore the leading position of elected organs vis-a-vis executive organs and their apparatus. The party's policy—economic, social, and nationalities policy—must be carried out primarily through the organs of people's representation.

The leadership of local affairs must be reorganized on principles of self-management, self-financing, self-sufficiency, and coordination of regional interests with general state interests. For this, it is necessary to create real conditions that will ensure soviets' responsibility and independence in solving problems concerning the comprehensive development of the territories under their jurisdiction. They must have steady sources of income based on long-term normatives, including receipts from all enterprises situated on their territories, build up resources essential for the economic development and enhancement of the life of the population, environmental protection, and the solution of other vital tasks, and form extrabudgetary development funds from supplementary income, including receipts from the population, with firm guarantees of the free disposal of resources obtained as a result of skillful leadership of the economy and socialist enterprise.

It is necessary to update the actual organization of the work of soviets: to broaden the range of questions resolved exclusively at sessions; to provide for the periodic release of deputies from their official and production duties for work in the soviet, standing commisions, and electoral okrugs; and to proceed on the basis that each soviet has within the framework of the law every possibility of choosing the forms and methods of its activity in light of local conditions. The nomination of several candidates, secret voting, and the holding of competitions must become the rule when forming ispolkoms and appointing and confirming the leaders of departments, administrations, and the services of ispolkoms. It is necessary to ensure that the work of all links of the soviets is carried out publicly and is constantly in the electors' sight.

The conference advocates that permanent presidiums of soviets be elected in local organs of power, except for rural and settlement soviets, and that their chairmen be elected by secret ballot in all soviets without exception. The recommendation, as a rule, of first secretaries of party committees to the posts of chairmen of the corresponding soviets should help enhance the role of representative organs.

Members of the ispolkoms of local soviets of all levels and also the leaders of their departments and administrations, judges, state arbiters, and prosecutors cannot become deputies of the corresponding soviet. This principle should be applied to members of the government and leaders of departments of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

The introduction of a limitation on the occupation of elected posts and posts subject to appointment and confirmation by soviets to two consecutive terms will be an important democratic prescription.

The restoration of soviets' authority and influence necessitates the substantial renewal of the existing electoral system. While positively assessing the experience built up in this matter since the 27th CPSU Congress the conference deems it essential to go further, ensuring unrestricted nomination of candidates, broad and free discussion of them, the inclusion on the ballot papers of a larger number of candidates than seats, strict observance of the democratic procedure of elections, regular reports by deputies, and the possibility of their recall. Extensive powers must be granted to okrug preelection meetings, which must become democratic forums for the competitive selection of candidate deputies. Soviets will become real working organs provided they have elected to them principled people, with a wide state vision, who firmly support socialist renewal and are capable of worthily representing their voters and energetically exercising the rights granted them.

The conference advocates the establishment of a single term of office—5 years—for soviets of people's deputies.

Having generalized the results of the debate on the CPSU Central Committee Theses and in light of the discussion at the conference itself, delegates consider it necessary to modernize the supreme organs of state power and advocate that the supreme organ of power in the country be the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which, in addition to deputies from territorial and national territorial electoral okrugs, is to include deputies representing the basic links of the political system—the party, trade unions, the Komsomol, and other mass social organizations, as well as cooperative, creative, and scientific organizations elected democratically at congresses or plenums of their central organs. The USSR Congress of People's Deputies, meeting at annual sessions, could resolve the most important constitutional, political, and socioeconomic questions of the country's life. The congress forms a comparatively small two-chamber Supreme Soviet of the USSR—a standing legislative, administrative, and monitoring organ—and elects the Supreme Soviet chairman by secret ballot. It is

necessary to eliminate the loss of functional identity of the chambers and to organize the work of standing commissions and deputies in a new way.

New approaches should be employed at the time of the formation and organization of the activity of soviets of all other levels, this being enshrined in legislation.

3. The conference sees as an important direction of the reform of the political system the decentralization of administration and a reallocation of functions and powers which ensures maximum initiative and independence locally. A departmental approach and local preference must be precluded and the functions of the center secured here, without which realization of the advantages of socialism and observance of all-union interests in the vast multinational state are impossible.

The conference observes that in the course of the economic reform and the reform of the political system there will be an increase in the role and responsibility of the USSR Council of Ministers as the highest executive and administrative organ of authority, accountable to the USSR Supreme Soviet, for the realization of domestic and foreign policy and the elaboration and implementation of the plans and long-term programs of economic and sociocultural development.

The democratization of society presupposes systematic work to simplify the structure and perfect the methods of work of the entire state apparatus. Superfluous components must be eliminated and the numbers of the apparatus reduced to the optimum level. It is essential that we have a new type of apparatus based on high professionalism, versed in modern information technology, democratically monitored by the people, and capable of advancing economic and social progress. Noting the positive significance of the work being performed in this field, the conference advocates its acceleration, with not a single component of the system of administration remaining outside of the restructuring. It would be expedient to create in the country a uniform system of public and state supervision subordinate to the elective organs of authority.

Paramount significance should be paid in implementation of the reform of the political system to questions of the development of the Soviet Socialist Federation in the interests of the continued strengthening of the equal fraternal alliance of all nations and nationalities in the USSR.

4. The conference deems a matter of fundamental importance the formation of a socialist law-based state as the form of the organization of political power corresponding fully to socialism. The accomplishment of this task is inseparably connected with the maximum assurance of the rights and liberties of Soviet man and of the responsibility of the state to the citizen and of the citizen to the state, the enhancement of the authority of the law and strict compliance therewith on the part of all party and state organs, social organizations, collectives, and citizens, and with the efficient work of law enforcement organs. A fundamental restructuring of the activity of these organs should be the crux of the legal reform, and the conference deems its rather rapid conduct to be expedient.

5. The reform of the political system presupposes a restructuring of such important components thereof as the social organizations. The unions, Komsomol, cooperatives, and women's, veterans, and other organizations, expressing the interests and cherished aspirations of various strata of Soviet society, are contributing to the formation of the domestic and foreign policy of the party and the state, in which the interests of our entire people are organically combined.

The recent emergence of a number of new social associations and formations [assotsiatsii i obyedineniya] setting as their goal assistance to the cause of socialist renovation should be seen as a positive phenomenon. At the same time, the conference condemns any activity aimed at undermining the socialist foundations of society, the incitement of national and racial hostility, and the preaching of war, violence, and amorality.

While evaluating highly the activity of social organizations, the conference notes the need for the democratization of their life, an enhancement of their independence and responsibility, and the emphatic surmounting of such shortcomings as excessive organization, formalism, and a weakening of self-motivating principles. For its part, the party will contribute in every possible way to ensuring that the social organizations comprehend their place in society in a new way and incorporate their creative potential in the renovation process more vigorously so the patriotic movement in support of the restructuring policy develops even further.

Under the one-party system which has taken shape historically in our country, the existence of a permanent mechanism of free dialogue, criticism and self-criticism, self-supervision and self-evaluation in the party and society is a question of vital significance.

6. The party is fully resolved to promote the strengthening of the social rights of the working people, which are a striking expression of the advantages of the socialist social system. Success on this path will be determined by the consistent implementation of the economic reform and an acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. In this connection, the conference emphasizes the need for a strengthening of labor discipline and the workers' conscious and creative approach to their production duties. The level and quality of social benefits which society can make available to its members will ultimately depend on the attitude toward labor of each collective and each Soviet individual.

Importance for a broadening of the citizens' political rights and personal liberties will be attached to the establishment in legislation of the procedure for realization of these constitutional rights and liberties. A particular place among them belongs to the rights of the individual to participate in management and to the expression of his opinion on any issue, and to freedom of belief. The law must reliably protect the citizen's personal dignity, the inviolability of his domicile, the secrecy of correspondence and telephone conversations, and so forth. Soviet people's rights and liberties are inseparably connected with their civic duties and with respect for the law, which is obligatory for all. Socialist democracy is incompatible with both willfulness and lack of responsibility.

7. The conference believes that the success of the reform of the political system will depend to a decisive extent on the work of the party, and makes it incumbent upon all party organizations and Communists to participate most assertively and creatively in tackling tasks which arise in this connection. As the initiator of the reform and active proponent thereof, the party is fulfilling in practice its mission of political vanguard of the working class and all working people.

The main feature of the historical moment in which we are living is to ensure that the activity of the CPSU corresponds in full not only in content but also in methods to Lenin's idea of the party's leading role in society. This demands primarily that party committees refrain from substituting for state and economic organs, preclude the adoption of party decisions containing direct instructions to the latter, and adhere strictly to the principle of the CPSU pursuing its political course through Communists working in the various spheres of the life of society.

The conference advances as a task of the present day the irrevocable abandonment of command-and-injunction methods of work by party organs and the strictest compliance with democratic principles and the requirements of the USSR Constitution and other laws. It is in accordance with the capacity for pursuing party policy in the new way and by the methods of ideological-political and organizational work among the masses that the level of the activity of each party organization and the maturity of party officials should be determined.

8. The vanguard role of the CPSU in the restructuring and renewal of society is impossible without a deep democratization of the party's internal life. The paramount task consists in fully restoring the Leninist understanding of the principle of democratic centralism, which makes provision for the freedom of debate at the discussion stage of questions and unity of action after decisions have been adopted by the majority. Measures to deepen intraparty democracy must be elaborated and implemented with a view to ensuring that all links of the CPSU operate in an atmosphere of party comradeship, free discussion of all topical questions pertaining to policy and practical activities, criticism and self-criticism, collectivism and conscious discipline, and personal responsibility.

The conference attaches great importance to the democratization of the life of primary party organizations. It is necessary above all, ridding them of petty regimentation from above, to enhance their independence, strengthen the authority of elected party organs and secretaries of primary party organizations, create conditions which would stimulate their work, and overcome the passiveness of a section of party members. The conference has noted that the level of involvement of Communists in the work of party committees does not match the needs of the radical restructuring of party work, development of intraparty democracy, and development of socialist self-management by the people. Every Communist must become a fighter for restructuring and for the revolutionary transformation of our society.

Democratization must also embrace such an important process as the admission of new members into the CPSU. It is necessary to work resolutely to put an end to regulating the replenishment of the party's ranks by means of the "quota allocation," which frequently creates artificial obstacles barring the admission into the party of leading and enterprising people. The main criteria to be used in assessing the qualities of someone who wants to join the party are his or her political stance, actual participation in restructuring, attitude toward work, and moral makeup. Here it is necessary to objectively take account of the opinion of labor collectives and to discuss questions relating to admission at open party meetings.

9. The conference regards the full restoration of the Leninist principle of collective discussion and adoption of decisions as one of the key avenues of the democratization of the party. It is inadmissible for the party apparatus to supplant elected organs, and for the role of Communists to be reduced to attending meetings and voting for lists of proposed candidates and finished draft resolutions. It is necessary to change the nature of party committee meetings and plenums, enhance their efficiency, and ensure a critical and constructive approach to the problems of political leadership and ideological education work.

The conference is in favor of broader participation by members of the CPSU Central Committee in the work of the Central Committee Politburo, of regular accounts and briefings of the Politburo to be delivered at Central Committee plenums, and of commissions made up of Central Committee members to be set up for various spheres of domestic and foreign policy.

The democratization of party life demands the utmost openness in the work of all party organizations and their leading organs. The conference supports the proposal to

publish the stenographic records of party committee plenums and drafts of resolutions under preparation on major questions of party and social life.

A special role in the renewal of intraparty relations belongs to the elective party organs. The conference draws attention to the need for regular accounts to be submitted to their committees by the bureaus of party raykoms, gorkoms, okrug committees, obkoms, and kraykoms, and union republic communist party central committees, and of party committees and party bureaus to primary and shop-floor party organizations. At the same time, Communists have the right to recall from elective party organs people who are not coping with their duties or who have compromised themselves, and, if necessary, replace, by way of election, the entire membership of an elective organ.

With democratization, the party's cadre policy is in need of serious renewal. The formal, nomenklatura approach to the selection and placement of cadres is becoming obsolete. The main method of the work of party committees in this sphere is to be the organization of the training and retraining of cadres, and their education bearing in mind their possible recommendation for leading posts in accordance with democratic procedures. The final solution of cadre questions must be determined by election results.

10. The conference regards the democratization of the election process in the party as a question of paramount importance. During the election of members and secretaries of all party committees up to and including the CPSU Central Committee, it is necessary to ensure the broad discussion of candidacies, secret ballots, and the inclusion on ballot papers of a greater number of candidates than there are mandates. It is deemed advisable to recognize the party organizations' right simultaneously with elections of delegates to a conference or a congress to introduce proposals for candidacies to the superior party organ, with the conference or congress delegates retaining the last word.

The conference supports the proposal for establishing a uniform term of office of 5 years for elective party organs from the CPSU Central Committee down to party raykoms. In view of this relatively long term of office, it would be desirable to introduce the practice of holding party conferences after 2 or 3 years and endowing them with the right of partial renewal—up to 20 percent—of the composition of party committees. This also applies to all-union CPSU conferences.

The limitation of terms of office in elected posts is called upon to be a most important guarantee against stagnation in the cadre corps. The conference deems it advisable, as from the upcoming report and election campaign in the CPSU, to put into effect the following rule: All bureau members and secretaries of party committees, including members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, can be elected to the same post for no more than two terms in succession.

11. With a view to improving control and auditing work in the party, and ensuring reliable guarantees against subjectivism, arbitrariness, and the influence of personal and casual circumstances on party policy, it is proposed to create a single control organ—a CPSU Central Control and Auditing Commission and corresponding organs at local level, abolishing the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee and the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and the party and auditing commissions of local organizations. The new organs must be elected at party congresses and conferences and be accountable to them.

12. The question of changes in the party apparatus assumes great importance in conditions of restructuring and the demarcation of the functions of party committees and state and economic organs. The conference believes that the structure of the apparatus of party committees must be entirely consonant with the tasks of strengthening political leadership and must accord with the aims of the new stage of restructuring. The party apparatus should be reorganized in the very near future, while simultaneously reducing its size and increasing the efficiency of its work. The principle of the strict subordination and accountability of the party apparatus to elected party organs must be strictly observed.

13. The reform of the political system is a major and intensive task that will require the adoption of responsible party decisions and major legislative acts, including substantial changes to the USSR Constitution, the constitutions of union and autonomous republics, and also the CPSU Statutes.

The conference recommends that Communists working in the relevant organs of state power and management and mass social organizations take the necessary measures to implement the program for democratizing Soviet society and reforming the political system approved by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

Anti-Bureaucracy Resolution

PM0407230188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 2, 3

[Resolution of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "On Struggle Against Bureaucratism"]

[Text] 1. The conference notes that the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th party congress marked the beginning of a genuine offensive against bureaucratism and its ugly manifestations, including diktat, administrative arbitrariness in the economy and the social and spiritual spheres, official [kazennoye] indifference toward the rights and needs of people, and a scornful attitude toward public opinion

and the working people's social experience. In the conditions of stagnation and fettered democratic institutions, bureaucratism grew to dangerous proportions and became a brake on social development. Bureaucratic perversions, especially in political leadership, are alien to socialism as the living creativity of the masses.

The radical economic reform, the reform of the political system, the processes of democratization in the party and society, glasnost, the development of criticism and self-criticism, and the real involvement of the people in the management of society are thoroughly undermining the positions of bureaucratism. But the struggle as a whole is yet to come.

The management apparatus remains unjustifiably cumbersome. A considerable part of it operates divorced from the requirements and interests of society. Measures elaborated by the party to transform the economy and other aspects of the country's life are often paralyzed through bureaucratic actions by ministries and state and economic organs and the passiveness of many party organizations and soviets of people's deputies. Departmentalism and parochialism are still widespread, while the varnishing of truth, willfulness, and violations of Soviet laws have not yet been overcome. There are many instances of suppression of criticism and crushing of working people's initiative.

It is the duty of all party organizations and all Communists to make the fullest possible use of the conditions created by restructuring for consistent and uncompromising struggle against the social vice of bureaucratism, and for high standards in the socialist management apparatus.

This struggle must be launched in the economy through rigorous observance of the laws on the enterprise and the cooperative system, of the powers of labor collective councils, through the utmost and all-embracing development of relations of economic accountability, independence and responsibility of enterprises, contractual, lease and cooperative forms of economic activity, and production democracy, and through improvement of the organizational structures of management.

This struggle must be launched in the social sphere by increasing concern for satisfying working people's material, everyday, and spiritual needs, through consistent implementation of the principle of socialist justice and the precise execution of laws.

The struggle against bureaucratism in sociopolitical life must be waged through the tireless deepening of democracy, the broad development of the forms of socialist self-management, and the enhancement and consolidation of soviet power, through working people's direct participation in the elaboration and implementation of state decisions, the expansion of information available to the population on the state of affairs in various spheres of society's life, and the intensification of people's monitoring of the activity of management organs. It is essential to repulse any attempts to replace democratic centralism by bureaucratic centralism.

The development of the offensive against bureaucratism in the spiritual and moral sphere means to revive Lenin's traditions and criteria of spiritual life, to creatively utilize and develop the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, to master and develop the new political thinking, and to be implacable toward manifestations of dogmatism, petty bourgeois morality, social parasitism, and official abuses. It is necessary to create an atmosphere of free comparison of views and opinions and to resolutely overcome petty tutelage and remnants of the command style in the leadership of science and culture.

The party will succeed in carrying along all social forces in the struggle against bureaucratism and in scoring real successes in this struggle only if it sets a convincing example of democratization of its own activity and of intraparty life, cleansing them of all bureaucratic accretions whatsoever.

2. The conference positively assesses the measures being implemented in conformity with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Central Committee June (1987) Plenum on the restructuring of management and the reduction of its links and apparatus, and it believes that this work must not be delayed or reduced to a one-shot campaign and to mechanical reorganizations. It must be conducted continuously, ensuring that the management system is in line with the changes constantly occurring within society.

It is necessary to aim for the transfer of more and more management functions and powers downward from the top, with centralized leadership being concentrated primarily on the main processes. Of particular importance are the improvement of management right at production level, the strict observance of the rights of labor collectives, as established by law, by leaders of all ranks, and galvanization of the work of the labor collective councils.

It is mandatory for party organizations and all Communists to aim for strict observance of the principle that the management apparatus serves, and is fully accountable to, elective organs, Soviet power, and the people. Any of its actions which leads to perversion or emasculation of laws and government decisions are anticonstitutional. Openness, and accessibility for monitoring and inspection by working people and the public must become the norm for the apparatus' work.

The apparatus' primary task is to organize matters competently. This requires substantial changes in the actual procedure for elaborating and adopting administrative decisions, simplifying it to the utmost, getting rid of the merry-go-round of overcautious coordination exercises and unnecessary requests for trivial background material and information from the localities, and

reducing statistical reporting many times over. There is a need to make use of the practice of submitting options for the solution of the most important economic and social problems to expert assessment by scientists, the public, and nationwide discussion or referendums.

The functions and responsibility of every management component and its workers must be precisely determined and demarcated. It is necessary to unswervingly implement Lenin's instruction: "...in all circumstances without exception collegiality must be accompanied by the most precise establishment of the personal responsibility of every person for a precisely defined job."

The conference advocates the resolute rectification of the situation where administrative organs in practice do not bear material responsibility for the negative consequences of their activity and both the people who execute the decisions and the labor collectives have no real means of influence on them. It is necessary to include the administrative apparatus in the system of new economic ties and relations, overcome the leveling approach to the remuneration of managers' work, and closely link this remuneration to the economically accountable results of the work of sectors, enterprises and organizations, and territories.

While combating bureaucratism it is at the same time necessary to cherish and strengthen in every way the authority of leaders. It is necessary to extensively develop the training and retraining of cadres in the sphere of management and to substantially enhance to management standards of leadership workers and specialists. A well coordinated, precisely operating, and flexible administrative apparatus is called upon to be an effective working instrument of restructuring.

3. It is necessary to make state and public institutions and party committees fully accessible to the working people, eliminate all kinds of procrastination, formalism, and red tape in the practice of the administrative apparatus, and eradicate situations where a person feels powerless in the face of a bureaucrat's indifference and stubbornness. Any attempts to encroach on citizens' legitimate rights by means of departmental instructions and bureaucratic subterfuges should be nipped in the bud.

It is necessary to substantially improve the organization of the procedure for receiving people on personal matters in institutions and enterprises and in party, soviet, and trade union organs. Avoiding the treatment of justified requests and legitimate demands from working people should be considered a serious official misdemeanor entailing the strictest punishment, up to and including removal from one's post. Ministers and other leading workers on union, republican, and local organs should actually receive citizens in the labor collectives, and resolve the questions that arise then and there and eliminate the shortcomings that are worrying people. Reports by leaders of all organs in the labor collectives and at citizens' places of residence should become the norm.

Leaders of party organs, up to and including CPSU Central Committee secretaries, should systematically meet with Communists and working people to resolve urgent questions of the life and activity of party organizations and labor collectives.

4. The conference demands that in the struggle against bureaucracy all party organizations make full use of cadre policy. It is necessary to ensure that the selection and placing of cadres take place openly, on a competitive, contested basis. The atmosphere of principledness, comradeship, and the responsibility of leadership cadres to the collectives that elected them is to be fully revived. Party organizations should withdraw their trust from Communists who, while holding responsible posts, display a formal attitude to the job, arrogance, or indifference to people's needs. Such people should be removed without delay and attempts to transfer them to other leadership posts should be nipped in the bud.

5. A decisive factor in the eradication of bureaucracy is real, full power of the people and the broad involvement of working people in the management of state and public affairs.

The conference stresses the exceptional importance of creating an integrated system of social and state control, subordinate to the elected organs of power. Party organizations should ensure that this system is based on the initiative and activeness of the people's masses and creative, veterans', women's, and other voluntary social organizations that express the interests of various strata and groups of the population.

The CPSU considers it its duty to create an atmosphere in the country such that every citizen will be confident that he will obtain satisfaction against bureaucrats from the soviets and the organs of people's control, that the trade union will uphold his labor and social rights, that the Komsomol will come to the defense of young people's interests, and that the law enforcement organs will set up a reliable guard against administrative tyranny and violations of rights and freedoms.

The conference deems it necessary to create legal conditions for stepping up the struggle against bureaucracy, and making provision for these in the legislative acts now being drafted. The practice of application of the USSR Law on Appealing to the Court Against Actions by Officials Infringing on Citizens' Rights should be improved.

The work of the apparatus should be regularly discussed and assessed at citizens' assemblies and meetings in labor collectives and public organizations.

The mass media are called upon to point out specific sources and manifestations of bureaucracy and examples of the successful struggle against it. The force of the genre of satire should be fully utilized in the struggle against negative phenomena.

6. The conference demands energetic measures from all party organizations to eliminate any elements of bureaucracy in their own activity and establish a Leninist style in their work. It is necessary to raise to a qualitatively new level the checking of the actual fulfillment of the party's decisions and political directives. In the struggle against bureaucracy this is a question of paramount importance, to which the attention of Communists working in ministries, departments, organizations, and institutions directly concerned with the satisfaction of people's needs and requirements is drawn in particular.

The principle of accountability and responsibility of all Communist leaders to the primary party organizations is to be consistently implemented, and it must be ensured that every leader has close links with the masses and sets an example of high professionalism, industriousness, modesty, accessibility, and respect for the people.

The work of every party organization should be built on the basis of the principle of collectivity, and the practice of systematic reports by elected party organs at party committee plenums and meetings of Communists is to be improved; criticism and self-criticism are to be developed; and violations of the norms of intraparty democracy should be dealt with strictly. No party organization and no worker should be outside control.

In the struggle against bureaucracy reliance should be placed on people who are enterprising, creative, and intolerant of sluggishness and stagnation, and who have demonstrated in practice their ability to operate by democratic methods. These are the people who should be supported in every way and recommended for party work.

The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference calls on Communists and all working people to be more active in launching the struggle against bureaucracy at all levels of administration and in all spheres of society's life.

Interethnic Relations Resolution

PM0407221588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[Resolution of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "On Interethnic Relations"]

[Text] 1. The Soviet socialist state created by V.I. Lenin embodies the revolutionary will and the aspirations of the multinational family of full and equal peoples. The commonality of their historical destiny is the basis of international socialist brotherhood. The unique union of republics was the result of the efforts of many generations of Soviet people. On its banner is the international unity of the working people of all nations and ethnic groups of the USSR, the right of nations to self-determination, the revival and development of national cultures, the acceleration of the progress of previously backward national regions, and the overcoming of interethnic discord. An integrated national economic complex took shape—the material foundation of the unity of the USSR's peoples. The economic, cultural, and cadre potential of all the republics and autonomous areas [avtonomiy] increased immeasurably. A new historic community—the Soviet people—became a reality. The natural logical growth of national self-awareness is taking place.

At the same time, the dynamism inherent in the initial stage of the formation of the multinational state of the Soviets was substantially wasted and undermined by a departure from the Leninist principles of the nationalities policy, by violations of legality in the period of the personality cult, and by the ideology and psychology of stagnation. The results achieved in the solution of the nationalities question were made absolute, and the notion that there were no problems in national relations became firmly established. The requirements of the socioeconomic and cultural development of both individual republics and autonomous formations, and also of national groups, were not adequately taken into consideration. Many acute questions brought to the fore by the actual course of development of the nations and ethnic groups were not tackled promptly. This engendered social dissatisfaction, which at times assumed the nature of conflict. Instances of national egoism and conceit, parasitic sentiments and parochialism continue to occur. The negative phenomena which built up over decades were ignored for a long time, driven under the surface, and were not duly assessed by the party. Restructuring, democratization, and glasnost have laid bare these phenomena, and at the same time, have created the necessary conditions for overcoming them democratically.

2. The party conference considers it a task of historic importance to persistently assert and creatively develop the Leninist norms and principles of the nationalities policy, and to resolutely cleanse them of artificial accretions and deformations. The basis for this is provided by the political course drawn up by the 27th CPSU Congress, which combines the satisfaction of the interests of all nations and ethnic groups with the common interests and needs of the country, and by an internationalist ideology that is incompatible with any brand of chauvinism and nationalism.

The development of the independence [samostoyatelnost] of the union republics and autonomous regions is viewed by the party as being indissolubly linked with their responsibility for the consolidation and progress of our multinational state. The socialist ideal is not stultifying unification, but is promoting full-blooded and dynamic unity within national diversity.

3. The party conference believes that in the context of the restructuring of the political system, urgent measures should be implemented for the further development and consolidation of the Soviet Federation on the basis of democratic principles. Above all it is a question of the expansion of the rights of the union republics and autonomous formations through the demarcation of the areas of competence of the USSR and Soviet republics, decentralization, the transfer to the localities of a number of managerial functions, and the strengthening of independence [samostoyatelnost] and of responsibility in the sphere of the economy, social and cultural development, and environmental protection.

One of the central tasks is to create conditions for the greater independence [samostoyatelnost] of the regions, and to implement such forms of cooperation whereby each republic may have a vested interest in the improvement of the end results of their economic activity as a basis for their own prosperity, and for the augmentation of the common wealth and might of the Soviet state. The radical economic reform and the process of democratization open up broad scope for the optimal combination of the interests both of national-state formations, and also of the country as a whole. Matters must be organized in such a way that the working people are well informed as to how much a republic or oblast produces, what its contribution to the country's economy is, and how much it receives. The idea of the transition of the republics and regions to the principles of economic accountability with the precise definition of their contribution to the solution of nationwide programs merits attention.

The internationalization of the economy and of all social life is a logical process. Any urge toward national exclusivity can only lead to economic and spiritual impoverishment.

A qualitatively new mechanism for the formation of republic and local budgets must be worked through legislatively and their role in tackling questions of the socioeconomic development of the regions must be substantially enhanced. It is essential to ensure the effective interaction of the territorial organs of management with the ministries and departments of the USSR and with enterprises of all-union subordination, while the responsibility of both republican and union organs of management for the comprehensive development of each region will have to be intensified. Questions of the development of direct links between union republics require in-depth legal elaboration and practical solutions.

The activity of those institutions of the political system through which national interests must be made known and coordinated should be galvanized. Of paramount significance in this connection is the enhancement of the role of the Soviets of people's deputies, above all the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, its standing commissions, and also the USSR Government. The creation of standing commissions on questions of interethnic relations is expedient in the USSR Supreme Soviet, the supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics, and, where necessary, in local soviets. The question of the formation of a special state body for the affairs of nationalities and national relations should also be examined.

The conference recommends that, taking account of the new realities, legislation pertaining to union and autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts and okrugs should be developed and renewed, reflecting more fully their rights and duties and the principles of self-management and representation of all nationalities in the organs of power in the center and locally. This will necessitate the introduction of the corresponding amendments to the USSR Constitution, and to the constitutions of union and autonomous republics.

4. It is important that in each national region, economic and social progress be accompanied by spiritual progress with reliance upon the cultural originality of the nations and ethnic groups. Socialist culture, developing as a multinational culture, must continue to remain a powerful factor for the ideological and moral consolidation of our society.

Concern must be shown so as to ensure that nationalities residing outside their state-territorial formations or not having such state-territorial formations receive more opportunities to realize their national-cultural demands, particularly in the sphere of education, contacts, and ethnic creativity, and also for the creation of centers of national culture, utilization of the mass media, and the satisfaction of religious needs.

A most important principle of our multinational state is that of the free development and equitable utilization by all USSR citizens of their native languages, and the acquisition of the Russian language voluntarily adopted by the Soviet people as a means of interethnic contact. All conditions should be created for the harmonious and natural development of national-Russian bilingualism, with consideration for the specific features of each region, and for ensuring that it is free from formalism. More concern must be show for the active utilization of national languages in various spheres of state, social, and cultural life. The study of the language of the people whose name a republic bears must be encouraged among citizens of other nationalities resident in its territory, and primarily among children and young people. None of this should run counter to the democratic principles of free choice of the language of education.

5. Every generation of Soviet people has its own way of studying in the school of patriotism and internationalism. It is important to ensure that, from an individual's very first social experiences, beginning with the family, the school, and the Young Pioneers and Komsomol organizations, these values are organically combined, operate in inseparable unity, and preclude national nihilism and national exclusiveness alike. It is necessary to discover the sources of our peoples' friendship, to

actively develop the culture of interethnic contacts, and to cultivate respect for the traditions, language, art, and history of the country's peoples and of other peoples in the world. Service in the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces must become a genuine school of internationalism.

The conference believes it is necessary to boost the sociopolitical importance of the nationwide holiday marking USSR Education Day.

Life has convincingly proved that national narrow-mindedness and chauvinist arrogance begin to develop whenever the practice of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism withers. It is the civic duty of every Soviet person to struggle against these ugly deviations and eliminate the causes giving rise to them. Any actions dividing nations and ethnic groups, as well as attempts to infringe on the rights of citizens of any nationality, must be perceived as morally unacceptable and inimical to the Soviet state's interests.

It is necessary to learn to differentiate between genuine national interests and their nationalist distortions. Any claims to national exclusiveness are impermissible and insulting, even for those on whose behalf they are made. In the spirit of Lenin's tradition, it is necessary to struggle primarily against "homegrown" nationalism and chauvinism, and this must be done mainly by representatives of the corresponding nationality.

6. The conference notes that multinationalism in our country's conditions is a powerful source of development and reciprocal spiritual enrichment of the peoples. The shaping of a socialist and internationalist way of life is the cause of the entire party and all Soviet people. For this purpose, it is necessary to mobilize the political experience, labor morality, and moral potential of the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia, and their profound commitment to the good-neighborly communal life of different peoples. A special role in this work is assigned to the Soviet intelligentsia. The overall climate in national relations depends to an enormous extent on its civic maturity and on the depth of its perception of the fundamental interests of its own people and society as a whole.

Any national problems require a considered and comprehensive approach on the basis of profound analysis and objective assessment of every specific situation. They must be solved calmly and with extraordinary responsibility, within the framework of socialist democracy and legality, primarily by taking steps toward one another, with due consideration for the ongoing processes of revolutionary renewal, and without detriment to the Soviet people's international cohesion. Work must be done to create a social atmosphere in which people of any nationality would feel at home anywhere in our socialist motherland.

7. A contemporary nationalities policy needs profound scientific and theoretical elaboration. This is a responsible civic assignment for scientific institutions and specialists. Its successful performance requires the creation of appropriate organizational and cadre prerequisites and the pooling of the scientific community's efforts. It is expedient to examine the question of creating on a statewide basis a scientific center for the comprehensive study of topical problems of national relations, and to expand scientific research and information work in this sphere.

8. Party organizations and Communists of all nationalities are called upon to be the cementing force, the soul of the socialist union of peoples, and active vehicles of internationalism. Their entire activity must be aimed at ensuring the working people's cohesion around the tasks of restructuring, shaping healthy public opinion, and carrying people along with them. It is necessary to firmly pursue, in the spirit of Lenin's demands, the line of ensuring that all nations and ethnic groups are represented in party, state, trade union, Komsomol, and economic organs, including at union level, and that the composition of leadership cadres most fully reflects the national structure of Soviet society.

The conference supports the CPSU Central Committee Politburo proposal to hold a Central Committee plenum on questions of national relations.

The conference expresses its firm belief that our present and future lie in the consolidation and unity of all Soviet peoples. It is the patriotic and international duty of every citizen and every Communist to preserve and augment everything that serves the cohesion of Soviet society as a foundation for the free development and flourishing of all USSR peoples and the strengthening of the might of our common fatherland. This is what V.I. Lenin called on us to do, and this is the path that the Communist Party is following.

Resolution on Legal Reform

PM0407224188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[Resolution of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "On Legal Reform"]

[Text] 1. The all-union party conference notes that during the period since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum major measures have been implemented to provide legal backup for restructuring. However, they should be regarded as merely the beginning of the great work connected with molding the socialist legal state. In the next few years it will be necessary to conduct a broad legal reform designed to ensure the paramountcy of the law in all spheres of society's life and strengthen the mechanism of the maintenance of socialist law and order on the basis of the development of people's power.

2. Great significance is attached to the improvement of the legislative activity of the supreme organs of power of the USSR and of union and autonomous republics aimed at strengthening the constitutional regime in the country and resolutely enhancing the role of Soviet laws regulating the most important spheres of social relations, and at the consistent implementation of the principle: Everything is permitted which is not prohibited by law. It is especially important to democratize the legislative process, which should be done on the basis of glasnost and the competent scientific evaluation and discussion of draft laws involving the broad public and all the people.

3. The fundamental review, codification, and systematization of the law are to be an inalienable part of the legal reform. In the light of the new conditions of economic management, the humanization and democratization of social life, and the intensification of the prevention of violations of the law it is necessary to make substantial changes to the law on socialist ownership, planning, financial, tax, and economic relations, and environmental protection, and to the norms regulating citizens' travel [grazhdanskiy oborot], labor, housing, pension, and other questions of working people's life, and to radically review the criminal, administrative, procedural, and corrective labor law. It is necessary to give paramount attention to the legal protection of the individual and to consolidate the guarantee of the implementation of Soviet people's political, economic, and social rights and freedoms. At the same time it is necessary to enhance the responsibility of each citizen to his labor collective, the state, and society as a whole. To ensure that government laws and resolutions strictly correspond to the requirements of the USSR Constitution it would be beneficial to establish a constitutional supervisory committee and also to intensify all monitoring work designed to ensure that the law's instructions are precisely observed in departmental normative acts and that the number of such acts is sharply reduced.

4. The conference considers one of the important tasks of restructuring to be to enhance the role of the court in the system of socialist democracy. It is necessary to considerably strengthen the guarantees of the implementation of such principles of Soviet legal proceedings as the adversarial system, glasnost, the strict observance of the presumption of innocence, and the impermissibility both of bias toward the prosecution and connivance with those who have infringed the Soviet law. It is necessary to enhance the prestige of the court, ensure the unconditional independence of judges and their subordination to the law alone, and determine concrete measures of responsibility for interference in their activity and contempt of court. One guarantee of the strengthening of judges' independence must be the election of rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray courts by superior soviets of people's deputies, as well as the establishment of the longer duration of their powers. To increase the objectivity of justice and the role and responsibility of people's assessors it is expedient to increase their number during the court examination of the most complex cases.

5. In the conditions of economic reform and the introduction of economic accountability, self-management, and self-financing, there arises a need to extend the powers of the State Board of Arbitration as regards strengthening contractual discipline and protecting the rights of enterprises and cooperatives, to substantially enhance the role of the organs of justice, and to strengthen legal services in soviets of people's deputies, ministries and departments, and economic organizations.

6. It is necessary to decisively enhance the responsibility of prosecutor's offices, to fully restore the Leninist principles of prosecutor's supervision whose purpose it is to strictly monitor the execution and uniform interpretation and application of laws throughout the country, and to persistently struggle against violations of socialist legality regardless of the perpetrators. The further strengthening of prosecutors' independence and the exclusion of any pressure on them and interference in their activity must serve this task.

7. Constant attention must be given to improving the militia's work, raising the standard and professional literacy of internal affairs organs' staffers, the strictest observance of socialist legality by them, the consolidation of their ties with labor collectives and the population, and the elimination of abuses existing in this area. In the interests of making better use of internal affairs organs' potential in the struggle against crime, it is deemed expedient to concentrate the investigation of the main bulk of criminal cases within the MVD investigations apparatus, constituting it as an independent structure not subordinate to republic or local internal affairs organs, to enhance the responsibility of investigators, to consolidate the legal guarantees of the legality of their actions, and to step up prosecutor's supervision of preliminary investigations.

8. The conference attaches great importance to enhancing the role of attorneys [advokatura] as a self-managing association for providing legal assistance to citizens, state enterprises, and cooperatives and for representing their interests in the courts and before other state organs and public organizations. The participation of defense attorneys in preliminary investigations and court proceedings must be expanded.

9. It is a matter of urgency to secure the cadres needed for the legal reform, presupposing the creation of a streamlined system for the selection, education, training, and further training of legal experts to be assigned for work in soviets of people's deputies, the national economy, the militia, and other law enforcement organs. For this purpose it is necessary to reorganize the training of scientific and teaching cadres of the highest qualifications, to preclude their detachment from practical work, and to enhance competence in the solution of legal questions concerning the implementation of the economic reform.

10. The shaping of a socialist state based on the rule of law, the reform of the political system, and the introduction of new methods of economic management demand the adoption of effective measures to restructure the legal education of the population, to organize universal juridical education as a uniform statewide and partywide program encompassing all strata of working people and all cadres at central and local level alike. Legal literature must be available to every Soviet citizen and published in the required quantity. An important place in cultivating respect for Soviet law, the culture of socialist democratism, and high civic activeness and responsibility must be assigned to secondary, vocational, and higher education, the mass media, the creative unions, and other public organizations.

11. The conference deems it expedient for the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers, with the participation of public and scientific organizations, to formulate and implement in the immediate future a specific action plan for the implementation of the legal reform in our country.

Resolution on Glasnost

PM0507000088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[Resolution of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "On Glasnost"]

[Text] 1. Guided by the interests of socialism and restructuring, the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference regards the further development of glasnost as one of the most important political tasks.

The first 3 years of restructuring have cogently confirmed that the atmosphere of glasnost in the activity of party, soviet, and public organizations and the mass news media, the development of real criticism and self-criticism, and the assertion of openness and truthfulness in politics have enabled the party and the entire people to gain a better understanding of their past and present, to reveal the braking factors, and to awaken powerful patriotic forces for vigorous and purposeful work for the good of the country and socialism. It is precisely the incorporation of glasnost in social life that has helped in assessing the situation in the country profoundly and objectively, with public participation, in formulating in a collegial fashion principled decisions on accelerating socioeconomic development, and in ensuring vigorous and interested support by working people for the CPSU's course of restructuring.

The conference regards glasnost as a developing process and emphasizes that its consistent expansion is an essential condition for the expression of the democratic essence of the socialist system, the orientation of that system toward man, and the involvement of individuals in all the affairs of society, the state, and the collective, and as an effective guarantee against distortions of socialism on the basis of nationwide monitoring of the activity of all social institutions and organs of power and management.

The conference sees glasnost as a necessary condition for implementing socialist self-management of the people and of the citizens' constitutional rights, freedoms, and duties, as a method of comparing and encapsulating all the diversity of interests existing in Soviet society and socialist pluralism of opinions, and as an effective way of strengthening internationalism and fostering socialist internationalism and of asserting the humanist complexion of socialism. Glasnost in all spheres of life is one of the most important conditions for further deepening the processes of restructuring and for restructuring's irreversibility.

In the international arena, glasnost, by revealing the positions of governments and peoples, helps to promote the cause of peace and cooperation, to strengthen the ideas of creating a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, and to form modern, civilized international relations. As a means of implementing the principles of an open foreign policy, it helps to involve social organizations, labor collectives, the working masses, and scientific and cultural figures in international contacts and to develop people's diplomacy. It also facilitates the solution of complex international problems at interstate level, along intergovernmental lines.

Ultimately, glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism serve the interests of the people, reflect the openness of society's political system, and are evidence of its strength, political viability, and moral health.

2. At the same time, the conference notes that glasnost, being a sharp weapon of restructuring, must itself be deepened and supported. A considerable mass of information remains inaccessible to the general public and is not used for the purposes of accelerating socioeconomic and spiritual development and improving the political culture of the masses and management cadres. There are attempts to curb glasnost in the activity of party, soviet, and public organizations, collectives, and the mass news media. Departmental and parochial barriers are frequently erected in its path. The desire to publicize particular shortcomings, abuses, instances of bureaucratism and communist arrogance, and other negative phenomena has met administrative resistance. The number of letters from working people making various complaints to party organs and the mass news media is not declining. Instances of persecution and even reprisals over criticism continue to occur. Cases where glasnost is used to serve personal or group ambitions have not been eradicated, thus destroying the normal channels of mutual contact and comradely exactingness between people. The inalienable principle of true glasnost, whereby freedom to express opinions should serve the

cause of elevating the individual and protecting his dignity and not humiliating him by means of slander and abusive labels, is not always implemented.

The conference stresses that the consistent expansion of glasnost is an essential condition of the unfolding of the processes of the democratization of all spheres of public life and the renewal of socialism. In developing glasnost, the party is invariably guided by Lenin's direction that the masses must know everything, form an opinion of everything, and embark on everything consciously. The Communist Party and the Soviet people need truth and complete and objective information on everything taking place in society. Glasnost must promote the consolidation of all social forces around the ideas and principles of restructuring.

3. The conference sees as the party's urgent task the all-around promotion of the assertion and development of the basic principles of glasnost: the inalienable right of every citizen to obtain on any social issue full and authentic information that does not represent a state or military secret; the right to open and free discussion of any socially significant issue.

The conference notes that the party is called upon to set an example of initiative in developing glasnost. Extensive information for Communists and the population on the work of CPSU leading organs and local party organizations and their committees and on the activity of leading cadres, open party forums and meetings, free discussion of questions of party life and party leadership of socialist building; an attentive approach to the examination of critical observations, opinions, and proposals from working people; promulgation and discussion of drafts of very important decisions—these are all components of the open character of CPSU policy and of the strengthening of its links with society.

It must be regarded as the duty of party leaders at all levels and members of elected party organs to regularly appear before party organizations and before labor collectives and the population to present information and reports on their work. It is the duty of party organizations to inculcate the culture of glasnost and the ability to conduct democratic polemics and comradely debates.

The congress believes it necessary to bring the existing instructions and rules of party committees' and organizations' work into line with the demands of the democratization of party life. Provision must be made for free access by members of elected party organs to sessions of the party committee bureau accountable to them, including the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and the right to use documents, information, and data in the posession of the party committee and its apparatus.

The conference attaches special significance to glasnost in cadre policy and to the creation of a democratic mechanism for promoting leading cadres based on public opinion.

4. The conference confirms that glasnost and openness to monitoring and criticism by the masses are an essential condition of the effective functioning of the organs of state power. Glasnost should be expanded at all stages of their activity, planning, and management; public opinion should be studied and taken into account; and there should be public discussion of statewide and regional economic, national, youth, ecological, social, and other problems.

Leaders of enterprises and institutions, the boards of kolkhozes and cooperatives, and labor collective councils are called upon to act in the manner of glasnost. Working people must be kept abreast of solutions to production and social questions and know the results of the activity and the financial status of their collectives. The administration is obliged to give the collective advance information of draft decisions affecting people's interests and to ascertain attitudes toward the projected measures.

Glasnost is an obligatory aspect of the activity of people's control and law-enforcement organs. Data on their work should be published regularly, along with statistics on the state of crime and measures to prevent it.

It is necessary to remove unwarranted restrictions on the use of statistics on the socioeconomic and political development of society and the ecological situation, create a system for gathering, processing, and disseminating this information based on modern information technology, ensure access to all library stocks, and regulate via legislation the use of archive materials.

The conference urges all social organizations to perform their statutory functions in the manner of glasnost and openness, giving the population extensive information on the work of congresses, conferences, and elected bodies and decisions made by them.

5. The conference notes the important role of the mass news media in expanding glasnost. They are called on to comprehensively reflect the activity of party, state, and social organizations, serve the consolidation of socialist society, actively propagandize accumulated experience, and be an instrument for nationwide monitoring of the situation in the country. The conference considers it impermissible to suppress critical articles in the press and also to publish information that is not objective and impugns the honor and dignity of the citizen. Glasnost presupposes social, legal, and moral responsibility on the part of the mass news media. The indispenable requirements in this sphere are a high ideological standard and morality, competence, strict observance of professional ethics, absolute reliability of information, and the right of each citizen who has been criticized to publish a valid response in the same press organ. Openness and criticism should not serve as grounds for the growth of cliquishness or manifestations of demagoguery and national, regional, or corporate egoism. The viewpoints

of all sides in a dispute must be reflected objectively and without distortion in the mass news media. No one has a monopoly on truth, and there must be no monopoly on glasnost either.

6. The conference believes that glasnost has fully proved its worth and that it must be comprehensively developed still further. With these aims in mind, legal guarantees must be created for glasnost, for which it is necessary to envisage constitutionally enshrining the right of USSR citizens to information. It is necessary to prepare legislative acts defining the rights and obligations of the state, officials, and citizens in the implementation of the principles of glasnost. It is necessary to create a system whereby working people are given constant and complete information on the situation in the enterprise, the village or city, the oblast, republic, and country and to legally enshrine the right of citizens, the mass news media, labor collectives, and social organizations to obtain information of interest to them. It is necessary to clearly define the limits of necessary secrecy and official secrets and to establish accountability for the dissemination of information which constitutes a state or military secret, violates citizens' legal rights, harms public order, security, and the health or moral well-being of the population, and also responsibility for preventing the exercise of the public's right to information and for its concealment, distortion, or unlawful use.

It is impermissible to use glasnost to harm the interests of the Soviet state or society, the rights of the individual, to preach war or violence, racism, and national and religious intolerance, to propagandize cruelty, or to spread pornography; it is also impermissible to manipulate glasnost.

By persistently asserting and expanding glasnost in party, state, and social affairs and in the mass news media, the party and Soviet society are setting in motion the mighty potential of the socialist system and its deep reserves. Without glasnost there is no restructuring or democracy. Glasnost is the natural atmosphere of the life and progress of democratic, humane socialism.

The conference urges all Communists and party organizations to spread the word of truth among the masses, actively develop socialist democracy and the culture of debate, and create conditions conducive to the lively and frank discussion of all questions and the display of Soviet people's initiative and creative thinking.

The conference expresses the confidence that all Communists will help to assert glasnost as the norm in the life of socialist society.

Resolution on Restructuring

PM0407220688 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Resolution of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "On the Progress of the Implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress Decisions and Tasks in Deepening Restructuring"]

[Text] 1. Having discussed the report of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "On the Progress of the Implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress Decisions and Tasks in Deepening Restructuring" and also the basic results of the first half of the 12th 5-Year Plan, the 19th all-union party conference states: The strategic course formulated by the party at the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th party congress aimed at the comprehensive and revolutionary renewal of Soviet society and the acceleration of its socioeconomic development is being unswervingly implemented. The country's slide toward economic and sociopolitical crisis has been halted.

The consolidation of society and an upsurge in the creative energy of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia are taking place under the influence of the ideas and actions of restructuring. People have come to believe in restructuring and are advocating its deepening and the imparting of an irreversible nature to the revolutionary transformations.

Democratization and glasnost have radically changed the ideological-political and social atmosphere.

A process of restoring the economy to health and reorienting it toward the satisfaction of people's urgent requirements has begun. The new methods of economic management are gathering momentum. The transfer of associations and enterprises to economic accountability and cost recovery is taking place in accordance with the Law on the State Enterprise (Association). A Law on the Cooperative System has been elaborated, extensively discussed, and adopted. New, progressive forms of intraproduction labor relations on the basis of contracts and leases, and also individual labor activity are becoming part of life. The restructuring of organizational structures of management aimed at creating favorable conditions for the effective management of the primary components of the economy is in progress.

The work begun on the party's initiative has made it possible for the growth of working people's real incomes to resume. Practical measures are being implemented to increase production of food products and consumer goods and expand housing construction. Reforms of education and health care are being implemented. Spiritual life is becoming a powerful factor in the country's progress.

Considerable work has been done to rethink the present-day realities of world development and update and impart dynamism to foreign policy.

Restructuring is thus becoming an increasingly deep-rooted part of the life of Soviet society and is exerting an ever increasing transforming influence on it.

At the same time, the conference notes that restructuring processes are progressing in a contradictory, complex, and difficult manner, in a confrontation between the old and the new. Although positive trends are in evidence and initial results exist, a radical breakthrough in economic, social, and cultural development has not occurred. The braking mechanism has still not been totally dismantled and replaced by a mechanism of acceleration. To a large extent, the economy is continuing to move along the extensive path. The pressure of gross-output and volume-indicator approaches has not been overcome.

The structure of the economy retains a basically cost-based nature. Scientific and technical progress is developing slowly, and plans for increasing national income and saving resources are not being fulfilled. There is no appreciable improvement in output quality. The country's financial situation remains complex. The food and consumer goods supply situation remains tight, and the population's demand for services is not being met. The housing problem remains acute.

In addition to the democratization of society, the radical economic reform is the foundation of all our restructuring. The reform is currently receiving renewed impetus from the transformation of the political system. This reform must be basically completed within the current 5-year plan. This, in turn, will determine both the rate and the success of the planned modernization of the political system. At the same time, the new economic mechanism being introduced sometimes malfunctions because relevant party and government resolutions are not fulfilled in the requisite manner in central departments. Leveling and freeloading attitudes remain a serious obstacle to the intensive development of the economy. Slowness is being displayed in creating the conditions for the wide spread of cooperative, contract, and lease forms of economic activity.

The heavy legacy of stagnation is exerting a restraining influence on the processes of restructuring. But the slow implementation of the projected transformations cannot be explained solely in terms of this. A great deal is rooted in the shortcomings in the current work of party, state, and economic organs and social organizations. There is a lack of the requisite persistence and purposefulness in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January and June (1987) Plenums. The new democratic methods of leadership, openness, and glasnost are finding it difficult to make headway and running up against conservatism, inertia, and dogmatism of thinking and action. The actual attitude to labor and action has not changed as it should in various components of society, including labor collectives. Conscientious fulfillment of one's obligations has still not become the norm. The standard of labor discipline does not match the requirements of restructuring. All this is having an impact on the end results of work.

At all levels of public, state, and economic activity, there are still many workers who are unwilling or unable to break with command and administrative methods and react badly to innovations. There are also considerable numbers who are afraid of the scale and depth of restructuring, who would prefer to stop half-way and restrict the revolutionary content of restructuring to half-measures. At the same time, there are attempts to artificially spur on events and leap past stages, and calls are made to resolve everything at a single stroke, taking no heed of the existence of objective preconditions or the level of social awareness.

With a view to overcoming the bureaucratic methods of administration characteristic of the administer and command system, the conference resolutely supports the course aimed at transforming the functions and work style of ministries and other central departments. The conference also resolutely supports eliminating superfluous components and transferring their rights to the localities, and substantially cutting the apparatus and raising the qualifications of the cadres employed in it. Dragging this matter out for a long time cannot be tolerated.

The activity of many party organizations—which have not managed to promptly and correctly assess the causes of braking, are biding their time, and are displaying irresoluteness in combating the old and rapidly mastering the new forms and methods of activity—is lagging behind the tasks of restructuring.

All this testifies that restructuring needs further deepening and reliable guarantees of its irreversibility. The conference stresses that restructuring is the only possible way to strengthen and develop socialism and solve the urgent problems of social development in the interests of the people. It is necessary to advance firmly and resolutely along this path, displaying staunchness and making realistic use of the possibilities of each given stage.

The conference considers that cardinal reform of the political system is coming to the fore today. Precisely this must open up new opportunities for deepening restructuring in all spheres of social life and provide guarantees of its irreversibility.

2. The most important task in the socioeconomic sphere is to accelerate the solution of the urgent problems of the people's prosperity.

The prime need is to achieve a substantial improvement in the country's food supplies. This is a most important sociopolitical question. The shortest way to resolve it involves revealing the potential of kolkhozes and sovkhozes in every way, based on development of diverse forms of contract and lease, as wellas creation of an extensive network of cooperatives—both within the framework of existing farms and in the context of mutual relations with other enterprises and sectors of the economy. It is necessary to adopt urgent measures to improve the transportation, processing, storage, and sale of agricultural produce and to make efficient use of funds allocated for the retooling and construction of enterprises in these sectors.

The conference believes that the necessary conditions have now taken shape in the country for kolkhozes and sovkhozes everywhere to switch to the new principles of economic management; also, all obstacles hampering this—both centrally and locally—should be removed. Special responsibility for the resolution of this task rests directly with kolkhoz and sovkhoz leaders and specialists, rural Communists, and soviets of people's deputies.

Any attempts to command kolkhozes and sovkhozes should be stopped immediately. They are capable of autonomously resolving questions of intrafarm activity and determining the forms of interfarm ties and production services. The key questions of present-day agrarian policy are the social reconstruction of the countryside, improvement of working and living conditions in the countryside, and provision of the necessary material and technical resources. The crux of agrarian policy is to restore the socioeconomic equilibrium between the city and the countryside and change production relations in agriculture itself.

Utilizing the potential of the new economic management mechanism, it is necessary to accelerate the saturation of the market with diverse goods and services and to launch work everywhere to increase the production of consumer goods. A radical retooling of light industry and other sectors producing goods in mass demand is required. Wide use should be made of local resources and the potential of the cooperative movement and individual labor activity. It is necessary to step up the interest of local soviets and labor collectives in increasing the production of goods to satisfy the needs of the region's population.

The conference approves the measures adopted to drastically increase the volume and pace and improve the quality of housing construction with a view to fulfilling the task set by the 27th CPSU Congress of providing virtually every family with an individual apartment or house by the year 2000. The conference notes that the expansion of the scale of state, cooperative, and individual housing construction and the initiative of the labor collectives and local soviets in this matter are held back by the weakness of the construction industry—above all, by the lack of construction materials and the acute shortage of special machines and equipment. The conference advocates the urgent resolution of these questions by government organs of the USSR and the union republics.

At the same time, it is necessary to thoroughly study and resolve questions connected with maintaining the housing stock in a suitable condition, ensuring democratic monitoring of the allocation of apartments, and establishing a fair system of payment for housing.

The conference regards as a most important task the unconditional fulfillment of the programs adopted for health care and environmental conservation and for improving the ecological situation in the country. All measures in these spheres should be based on people's interests and on a social orientation, while the efficiency of work should be enhanced considerably through the introduction of economic incentive methods and timely scientific and engineering backup.

The core of all structural and investments policy and the starting point for establishing the pace and proportions of reproduction should be the 27th CPSU Congress line on social reorientation of the economy. This is linked inextricably with a new quality of economic growth, all-around intensification of production, the saving of resources, acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and modernization of machine building. This approach should also determine the concept for the 13th 5-Year Plan.

In developing and deepening economic reform, it is necessary to complete the formation of the new economic mechanism and take the principles of reform to every primary labor collective and every work place. It is necessary to drastically step up people's interest in the highest possible end results, totally eradicate leveling, and be guided more boldly everywhere by the principle of remuneration of labor, according to its quantity and especially its quality, not allowing a situation to exist in which it is possible to live comfortably while doing poor work.

The conference stresses that the resolution of all economic and social tasks can only be ensured on the basis of voluntary, highly productive labor by Soviet people.

It is deemed expedient within the framework of the present 5-year plan to complete the working out of the economic mechanism and to carry out the restructuring of organizational structures of management centrally and locally and of the system of foreign economic ties. The switch to wholesale trade in the means of production is to be accelerated, along with implementation of the program of financial improvement of the national economy, including the imposition of order in the budget, the financial and credit system, and the activity of banks. After nationwide discussion, there is to be a reform of pricing and a review of wholesale, purchase, and retail

prices. In implementing the retail price reform, it is necessary to adhere firmly to the principle that a change in prices should do no damage to people's living standard.

3. Revolutionary restructuring is impossible without the all-around activation of society's intellectual and spiritual potential and scientific and technical progress, an increase in the scientific and technical contribution of scientific and engineering cadres, the enhancement of their prestige, and the improvement of their working conditions, up-to-date standards throughout the education system, and the growth of people's general and political culture.

The conference stresses the great significance of intensive development of the fundamental and applied sciences, resolution of the acute problem of the introduction of discoveries and inventions into practice, and a permanent link between science and production. New forms of organization of scientific life are needed. A profound restructuring is vitally necessary in the social sciences, which must totally eradicate dogmatism and dissociation from real life. It is their duty to creatively study topical and long-term questions of socialism's development and problems of world development and to increase the real benefits for policy and for society.

The conference advocates the further democratization of the sphere of science and culture and creation and development of a material base for this sphere that accords with the demands of the restructuring of society. Supporting the diversity of efforts and of the artistic pursuit of truth, competitiveness, innovation, and continuity, the party counts on activeness, dedication, and a high sense of responsibility to the people on the part of figures in science, literature, and art.

The conference attaches fundamental significance to augmenting the theoretical arsenal of restructuring, renewing ideological work, ridding it of routine, empty verbiage, and stereotypes, bringing its content and tone into line with the realities of life, and learning to conduct an honest, direct discussion with people on all the questions that interest them.

The raising and education of the young generation is a responsible task for the CPSU and all our society. The conference demands the consistent and accelerated implementation of the reform of secondary and higher education. This applies to the strengthening of their material base and, most importantly, to the role of the teacher, instructor, and educator.

The party sees young people as an active and enterprising force for restructuring. The conference considers it necessary to have a strong, integrated state policy regarding the young generation, so as to create conditions that will enable young people to acquire independence as early as possible, uncover their potential to the maximum and realize their goals in life, and be better prepared to take on in good time the economic, political, and moral responsibility for the country's fate, the fate of socialism.

The conference advocates the full restoration of the Leninist traditions of party leadership of the Komsomol and observance of its organizational autonomy and right to participate in political activity and the elaboration of policy and to uphold young people's interests in party, soviet, and economic organs. The Komsomol bears a special responsibility to the whole of society for its work in the pioneer movement—that first school of civic awareness and morality.

The conference draws attention to the need to solve more vigorously problems directly affecting women's interests. Women must be widely represented in leading organs from bottom to top. It is necessary to increase their role in society and political life, to defend and protect the mother's authority and rights, to create the conditions for her to perform her duties, and to intensify concern for young families.

4. The conference approves the proposals for the reform of the political system set out in M.S. Gorbachev's report and advocates their practical implementation.

Key importance attaches to the demarcation of the functions of party and state organs and the revival of the sovereign power of soviets from bottom to top. Together with the reform of the judicial system and other institutions ensuring the legal regulation of relations between the state and citizens and the protection of the political, economic, social, and personal rights of all members of society, this is aimed ultimately at completing the creation of a socialist law-based state in which the unconditional subordination of absolutely everyone to the law will be the supreme principle.

The conference regards as most important preconditions of the efficient functioning of the political system a transformation of supreme power in the state, envisaging the convening of congresses of USSR people's deputies, the activity of a two-chamber Supreme Soviet on a regular basis, the institution of a post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet, the democratic exercise by them of their prerogatives, and constitutionally regulated interaction among all the top echelons of power, including the USSR Council of Ministers.

The conference advocates renewing in the spirit of restructuring the activity of social organizations and associations—trade union, Komsomol, women's, veterans', and others and creative unions—and considerably increasing their role in the functioning of the political system and in implementing and coordinating the interests of various strata of the population for the good of the whole people.

5. The conference notes that the CPSU, assuming the revolutionary initiative, was able to provide an objective critical analysis of the state of society and the party itself, put forward a program of restructuring, rallied the broad people's masses around its ideas, and organized practical work for the revolutionary transformation of social relations. Thus the Communist Party has demonstrated yet again that it is the bearer of society's program goals and acts as the vanguard of the people.

In conditions of the demarcation of the functions of party and state organs, there must be a full revival, taking due account of contemporary conditions, of the Leninist concept of the party as the vanguard of society which, basing itself on the Marxist-Leninist teaching, ensures the theoretical elaboration of the most important questions of the country's development, formulates the ideology of restructuring, and via this, via organizational work among the masses, by inspiring and uplifting them, imparts the correct, socialist direction to the advance of our entire multinational society. The party implements cadre policy, ensuring the rational placement of cadres via the democratic mechanisms of the transformed political system. The CPSU must implement its political line via the Communists working in state and economic organs, in social organizations, and in labor collectives. The party operates within the framework of the Constitution and Soviet laws.

The resolution of the tasks of restructuring, which are crucial [sudbonosnyy] for the country and for socialism, requires enhancement of the party's leading role and new criteria for assessing its performance of this its role.

The CPSU will never henceforth permit a repetition of anything like what was associated with the periods of the personality cult and stagnation, which caused profound deformations in the socialist society, delayed its development for entire decades, and resulted in tremendous loss of life and incalculable moral and ideological losses.

6. The conference approves the CPSU Central Committee's international activity, which is based on the new political thinking, and the new methods of incorporating the Soviet Union's peace-loving intentions in world politics. It confirms that only a political approach toward resolving the contradictions of world development and regulating conflict situations opens up the opportunity for the USSR to play its historically predestined role in ensuring the survival and further progress of mankind.

In this context, the conference highly assesses the principled line of and practical measures taken for strengthening internationalist collaboration with the socialist countries, improving Soviet-U.S. relations, revitalizing the all-European process, and developing links in the Asian and Pacific region, Latin America, and Africa and the fruitful contacts with the Nonaligned Movement and with various political parties and the world public. It approves the efforts in support of the prestige of the United Nations, as well as efforts to settle regional conflicts on the basis of the principles of national reconciliation and freedom of choice.

The conference regards as correct the Soviet leadership's approach toward the problem of removing the threat of war via frank, constructive dialogue and disarmament, an approach which opened the way for the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and for transferring the talks on nuclear, chemical, and conventional armaments to a practical plane.

The conference totally approves the decision on withdrawing troops from Afghanistan on the basis of the Geneva agreements and of an attitude treating this neighbor of ours as an independent, neutral, nonaligned state.

Foreign policy activity must make an increasing contribution to releasing the country's resources for peaceful building and for restructuring and be closely linked with the democratization of society, including the process of formulating decisions and monitoring their execution.

All defense building must henceforth be geared predominantly to qualitative parameters—with regard both to equipment and military science and to the personnel of the Armed Forces. In guaranteeing the reliable security of the Soviet state and its allies, it must be implemented in strict accordance with our defensive doctrine.

Restructuring needs a foreign policy that fully [adekvatno] reflects its humanist essence and gives Soviet society broad access to mutually advantageous cooperation and diverse democratic links with the surrounding world.

The conference confirms the CPSU's course of invariable solidarity with the struggle of communist and workers parties and all social forces for peace and social progress, for freedom and democracy.

7. Expressing the will of the 20 million-strong army of communists and the vital interests of the Soviet people, the conference declares: The party will persistently and purposefully deepen the process of revolutionary restructuring, ensure its irreversibility, and do everything to achieve its aims.

The conference calls on all party organizations and all Communists and nonparty people to join still more actively in the processes of society's renewal, which are of historic importance to the fate of the motherland.

8. The conference deems it necessary that the CPSU Central Committee ensure the examination of all specific proposals and requests voiced by the conference delegates in the name of the Communists who elected them, and also the proposals and questions set out in the

collective and individual appeals sent to the conference in the course of the discussion of the theses, and provide information via the mass news media on the results of the examination.

PRAVDA Editorial on Conference, Future

PM0307185388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Jul 88 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Restructuring Must Stride Ahead. Party Conference Decisions Are Enormously Important for the Country's Destiny"]

[Text] The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference was in session for 4 days in Moscow. For 4 days the attention of millions was fixed on the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, where there took place a great party discussion—unprecedented, it can be said, in its openness, candor, and Bolshevik forthrightness—on our present and our future and on how to render irreversible the revolutionary restructuring launched in the country on the initiative and under the leadership of the party.

And this attention, these hopes and aspirations that were pinned on the forum of Soviet Communists were not in vain. The conference was held in the Leninist spirit, it was a triumph of high responsibility to the people and the revolution. Of course, it will take time for people to fully analyze the content and the results of the work done at the conference, but even now it is already quite clear that an event that will go down as a restructuring landmark has taken place in the life of the party and the country. It is already clear that the decisions formulated and adopted by the conference are immensely important for the country's destiny; they are an integral component of the changes and, at the same time, their powerful accelerator.

The main result of the conference, M.S. Gorbachev noted in the closing speech, is that a programmatic political stance has been formulated on all the fundamental questions that were topics for partywide and nationwide discussion on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee Theses.

And the conference did not simply approve the proposals submitted by the Central Committee, but also greatly enriched them with the real-life experience of party organizations and labor collectives. The speeches by the delegates—workers, kolkhoz members, scientists, cultural figures, enterprise leaders, party officials—were imbued with profound responsibility for the fate of restructuring; issues were raised in a blunter and more principled manner then ever before. The debate reflected what had been achieved in the 3 years or so since the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee—the very political atmosphere itself that is now being established in the country, the unshackling of creative thinking, and the level of democratic development.

The main question submitted for examination at the conference concerned the all-embracing democratization of our society's life and the broadening of the restructuring front in every possible way. Just think about the very names of the resolutions adopted: "On the Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks of Deepening Restructuring," "On the Democratization of Soviet Society and the Reform of the Political System," "On the Struggle Against Bureaucratism," "On Interethnic Relations," "On Glasnost," and "On Legal Reform." Finally, there is the resolution "On Certain Urgent Measures To Implement the Reform of the Country's Political System," which, as it were, triggers the "launch mechanism" for the implementation of the planned transformations. Thus, we have embraced what is essentially the entire range of problems facing the party and the country.

The conference focused its attention on the question of the party's new role as society's political vanguard. The report, the delegate speeches, and the adopted resolutions revealed the firm conviction that the action program drawn up by the 27th CPSU Congress and enriched by the existing experience of restructuring retains its full force and is undoubtedly supported by the people, who have adopted the restructuring policy and will not allow it to falter.

Yes, quite a few critical remarks were heard at the conference, including remarks addressed to party organs, even the top echelons, as well as individual officials. Furthermore, everyone can see for himself from the conference material published by the press that nothing like this had occurred in our country for almost 6 decades in terms of the heat and sharpness of the debate that developed. But the desire to see our party even stronger and even more cohesive was passionately and demandingly heard over all the "shades of opinion," over all the at times diametrically opposed assertions, arguments, and propositions.

The conference called for our party to be totally a party of the Leninist type not only in content but also in methods of action. What does this mean? We are talking primarily about consigning the command and edict methods irrevocably to the past, about implementing party policy exclusively through organizational, cadre, and ideological work—with the strictest observance of laws and the democratic principles of social life.

This also means that party organizations and their committees must resolutely put an end to the practice of supplanting and duplicating state organs and dictating to trade unions, the Komsomol and other social organizations, and the creative unions. And some people's apprehensions that the party's leading role might weaken in such conditions are mistaken. Nothing of the kind! The party remains the ruling party and, as was said at the conference, it has at its disposal all the necessary levers

to implement its leading role. And the main lever is the 20 million Communists through whom the party is called upon to implement its political course in all spheres of society's life.

The resolve to continue and to deepen the radical economic reform came over loud and clear at the conference. The prerequisites for this were created through the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum decisions and the laws on the state enterprise and the cooperative system. At the same time, experience shows that in many areas the reform is still skidding on the spot, that bureaucratism's resistance is by no means crushed, and that therefore it is necessary to seriously get down to completing the dismantling of the braking mechanism and to apply all our efforts for an energetic advance.

Another sore point raised by many delegates at the conference concerns the solution of the food problem in the country. The task of concentrating our main efforts in this most important area was brought to the fore. Additional capital investment and resources have already been funneled into this sphere along different channels, and reserves have been brought to light. It is important for all this to be properly assimilated and activated. Our paramount duty today is to give utmost assistance to the peasantry and to boost the countryside. A lot can and must be done here without any delay, right in this 5-year plan period.

At the contemporary stage, under the tremendous influence of the scientific and technical revolution on all social processes, no problems can be successfully solved without involving the people's intellectual and moral potential. It was no coincidence that the conference discussed the most urgent questions of politics and the economy in close relationship with the spiritual sphere, that they acquired a kind of moral dimension, overflowing into the problems of science, education, and culture. The diversity of, and at times the clash between, different viewpoints demonstrated the socialist pluralism of opinions that rejects spiritual monopoly and that is asserted by the party in our social life; a pluralism whose starting point is man and the people's interests, and whose main goal is the establishment of the humanist values of socialism, the ensuring of a pure moral atmosphere in society.

It is natural that, in this context, the question of glasnost also acquires paramount importance. Life teaches us that the greater the truth, the greater the faith in the cause launched by the party, in its goals and ideals. Without glasnost there is no democracy, there is no socialism. Our mass media must work even more energetically on sweeping away all kinds of negative phenomena and supporting the living shoots of experience, the bold and extraordinary [neordinarnyy] approaches and people—the true heroes of restructuring. At the same time, glasnost presupposes high responsibility. It is incompatible with cliquishness, the distortion of facts, and the settling of personal accounts. Delegates' speeches voiced the demand to eradicate group and departmental ambitions and bias, and claims to a monopoly on truth.

The conference debate revealed yet again the need to cultivate high standards of political culture, the culture of criticism, the culture of comradely polemics which, alas, is in such short supply in many of us. It also demonstrated once more the erroneous and dangerous nature of hasty and unconsidered improvisations in politics, of demagogic incantation, of rushing ahead, of bureaucratic administration, of attempts to act by means of "revolutionary leaps." Quick-fire "exhortatory" slogans are just as inappropriate for restructuring as any delay.

And so, the decisions have been adopted, the course has been verified. Very serious work lies ahead. It must not be forgotten that the very authority of the party will itself undergo a serious test in conditions of democratization, the planned change in party committees' functions, and the formation of a socialist state based on the rule of law. Restructuring and the reform of the political system will create a fundamentally different situation in society. In the new conditions the leading role of the party, and indeed of any one of its officials, will be generally determined no longer by the cachet of a given title or office, as happened so often in the past, nor by past services, but by the real authority that will have to be demonstrated anew every time by specific deeds. This means that the party cannot and must not any longer tolerate the so-called "dead wood." Every Communist, if he really deserves this title, is called upon to become a fighter for restructuring, for the revolutionary renewal of society. This is the party conference's first and foremost instruction.

And of course, not a fighter in words only. Only too often our decisions, even when profoundly considered and properly worked out, have essentially remained on paper because their implementation was delayed and they were engulfed by the halfhearted approach and all manner of bureaucratic quagmires. The key to success lies in the resolute eradication of chronic ailments like these. The main thing now is to set to work boldly, thoroughly, and without delay, to solve specific tasks without waiting for any additional edicts, instructions, or circulars. The party's entire life must be built in line with the adopted resolutions.

It is in this precise area that conference delegates are called upon to work among the masses on their return to their home collectives, as is our entire party and ideological aktiv. The very course and results of the conference and the thousands of letters arriving in the editorial office right now testify that people believe in restructuring and demand that we move forward without stopping.

And we will march on, we will work persistently for the practical implementation of the set tasks! We will only get there by moving. Through democratization, economic reform, and the transformation of the political system we will render restructuring irreversible. Through revolutionary renewal we will reach a qualitatively new state of our society, and socialism will present to the world its new, its genuinely humane and democratic face.